

Liquor Dealers' Association of Pittsburg, Pa., for bill H. R. 4490—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McLane Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Union City, Pa., to amend the pension act of March 2, 1903—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William Wean, secretary of the Patriotic Order of Sons of America of Philadelphia, Pa., for passage of bill S. 4403—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Farmers' Institute Workers, for an appropriation for experiment station work—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 2417, to establish an assay office at Dahlonega, Ga.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petition of the Presbyterian Church at Hopkinton, Iowa, for a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of light beer and wines to the Army canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: Petition of Local Union No. 444, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Princeton, Ind., for settling national disputes by a court of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Western Cottage and Piano Company and other firms, against undue restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 66 American artists, for admission of works of art free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chicago Clearing House Association, for bill H. R. 23017, for national banks to issue unsecured credit notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Liberal Immigration League, against restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of Pennsylvania, for the pending bill in the Committee on Ways and Means (H. R. 4490)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Kanline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of W. Hayes et al., citizens of San Jose, Cal., against employment of Asiatic coolies on the Panama Zone—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago Clearing House Association, for bill H. R. 23017 (credit currency bill)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Reinhold Richter Camp, No. 2, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. Hayes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Business Men's Association of New Britain, Conn., for an increase of post-office clerks' salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of the New Britain (Conn.) Business Men's Association, for an increase of salaries of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Carter Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Agelia Mittag—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the Lebanon Disciples' Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LORIMER: Petition of Joseph E. Otis, president of the Western Trust and Savings Bank, of Chicago, Ill., for bill H. R. 23017—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Chicago Clearing House Association, for bill H. R. 23017, for national banks to issue unsecured credit notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Illinois Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, for an adequate training ship—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Citizens' Bank of Louisiana—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. W. Handlin—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas H. Unde—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Frederick G. Ackerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank W. Latimer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred L. Castle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for certain amendments to the railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Myron T. Palmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Society of Art, for forest reservation in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Earl, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

## SENATE.

Monday, January 28, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

### INVESTIGATION OF MONOPOLIES IN COAL AND OIL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its investigation of the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies in coal and oil; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW COAL LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial of the National Council of the Chickasaw Nation, approved by the governor of that nation December 22, 1906, relative to the segregated coal lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### ALLOTMENT OF INDIAN LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs submitting a draft of a bill to amend section 4 of the act approved February 8, 1887, to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and Territories over Indians, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### MAIL MATTER OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the mail matter entered at the Washington city post-office by the Librarian of Congress under the penalty privilege for the period July 1 to December 31, 1906; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7034) to incorporate the International Sunday School Association of America with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 24285. An act to provide for holding terms of United States courts at Clarksdale, Miss.;

H. R. 24603. An act to authorize the Atlanta, Birmingham and Atlantic Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution continuing the Postal Commission until the close of the present session of Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 16944) to amend sec-

tion 878 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CREDENTIALS.

Mr. CARTER presented the credentials of JOSEPH M. DIXON, chosen by the legislature of the State of Montana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1907; which were read and ordered to be filed.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Chicago Clearing House, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting national banks to issue unsecured credit notes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Camden, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Hinsdale, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State board of agriculture, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of the gypsy and brown-tail moths; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Anacostia Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of the tracks of the Washington Traction and Electric Company from First and G streets NW., by way of Massachusetts avenue and First street, to First and E streets SE.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of J. W. Latimer, of Washington, D. C., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of metallic file cases for the clerk's office of the supreme court of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of Frank Keck, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the present postal fraud-order law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cairo, of the Aid Society of Nichols, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and of sundry citizens of Castile, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented the petition of Thomas P. Murphy, of Pennsylvania, and the petition of Joseph V. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a memorial of the board of trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the national bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lancaster, Reading, Birdsboro, and Baumstown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kane, Lititz, and Darby; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Canton; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pittsburg; of the congregation of the Memorial Presbyterian Church, of Lancaster; of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Fourth Methodist Protestant Church of Pittsburg; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg; of the Young Men's Christian Association of Lititz; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Montoursville; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of

Pittsburg; of the congregation of the Free Methodist Church, of Franklin, and of the congregations of the Presbyterian, the Church of Christ, and the Methodist Episcopal churches of Canton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Mahopac, Ossining, Port Chester, Copenhagen, Pleasant Plains, Westfield, and Onondaga County, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of the congregation of the First Swedish Church of Tracy, of sundry citizens of Little Sauk, Round Prairie, Hamline, St. Paul, Hubbard, Lynd, and Marshall, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the deepening of the channels of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "naval personnel bill," which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the United Spanish War Veterans' Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclassification and increase in the salaries of postal clerks in all first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbus and a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ashland, in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARNER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Randolph County, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRAZIER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Petersburg, Knoxville, Obion, Bon Air, Beulah, McLemoresville, Cowan, and Lebanon, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Edward McGowan, of Tennessee, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Bureau, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Clearing House Association, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting national banks to issue unsecured credit notes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Castle, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DICK presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 7560) granting an increase of pension to James Vincent Brough; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.



Mr. HALE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Orono, Turner, Madison, and Steuben, all in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry women's clubs of Skowhegan, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the employment of child labor in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. DANIEL presented a memorial of the Council of Jewish Women, of Richmond, Va., and a memorial of the Liberal Immigration League, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Richmond, Va., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the Biological Survey department in the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Clearing House, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting national banks to issue unsecured credit notes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Peacham, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the Dairy and Food Department of Coopersville, Mich.; of the Houston Truck Growers' Association, of Houston Heights, Tex.; of Newark Grange, No. 366, Patrons of Husbandry, of Newark, N. Y.; of Thorofare Grange, No. 59, Patrons of Husbandry, of Thorofare, N. J.; of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, of Providence, R. I., and of Fairview Grange, No. 1137, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sharpsburg, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the free distribution of seeds and plants; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of G. R. Pike and sundry other citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the mayor and board of aldermen of Manitowoc, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bannock County, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the irrigation of lands adjacent to Pocatello, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24538) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report thereon. To-morrow morning, after the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill and dispose of it, because it is very important, as we are greatly behindhand with the appropriation bills, and they should be passed as fast as they reach us.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16868) for the prevention of scarlet fever, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, epidemic cerebro-spinal meningitis, and typhoid fever in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4875) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Wood;

A bill (S. 3266) granting an increase of pension to William P. McKeever;

A bill (S. 7220) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Bethel; and

A bill (S. 7598) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Newell.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were

referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7948) granting an increase of pension to Jane Tate;

A bill (S. 7918) granting an increase of pension to R. T. Melvin; and

A bill (S. 7919) granting an increase of pension to John D. Abel.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6076) granting an increase of pension to John McKnight; and

A bill (S. 6954) granting an increase of pension to Henry Matter.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7223) granting a pension to Joseph W. Little; and

A bill (S. 7268) granting an increase of pension to De Wayne W. Suydam.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4936) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Grell, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7724) granting an increase of pension to Paul J. Christian;

A bill (S. 7357) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Bailey; and

A bill (S. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Ludwig Schultz.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 23821) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 463) granting an increase of pension to Justin C. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 7782) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Reuter; and

A bill (S. 6567) granting an increase of pension to George C. Gibson.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4501) granting an increase of pension to Horatio S. Brewer;

A bill (S. 7678) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kennedy;

A bill (S. 7063) granting an increase of pension to William F. Hastings; and

A bill (S. 7482) granting an increase of pension to Wilford Herrick.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7054) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Clapp;

A bill (S. 7610) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kurz;

A bill (S. 7609) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Strong;

A bill (S. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Rust;

A bill (S. 6570) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cole;

A bill (S. 7477) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Cooney;

A bill (S. 7479) granting an increase of pension to George L. Corey;

A bill (S. 6467) granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith;

A bill (S. 7570) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hapgood; and

A bill (S. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shattuck.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7493) granting an increase of pension

to George Arthur Tappan, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7) granting an increase of pension to Edwin B. Lufkin; and

A bill (S. 8015) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Hunter.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 8038) granting an increase of pension to John F. Ackley;

A bill (S. 7064) granting a pension to Edward T. Blodgett;

A bill (S. 6969) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Lewis;

A bill (S. 6063) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Chase;

A bill (S. 12) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Littlefield;

A bill (S. 6913) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Murdough; and

A bill (S. 7427) granting an increase of pension to George L. Danforth.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7175) granting an increase of pension to Adline Mabry;

A bill (S. 5940) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bittleston;

A bill (S. 7098) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Teague;

A bill (S. 7998) granting an increase of pension to George N. Julian; and

A bill (S. 5692) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Craigo.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7174) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Faggart;

A bill (S. 6912) granting an increase of pension to James G. Harvey; and

A bill (S. 7667) granting a pension to Henry Lunn.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2394) granting an increase of pension to John A. J. Taylor;

A bill (S. 7329) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Turner; and

A bill (S. 7567) granting a pension to William Booth.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7822) granting an increase of pension to William N. Bronson;

A bill (S. 3275) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Harrison; and

A bill (S. 7503) granting an increase of pension to George W. Baker.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7504) granting an increase of pension to David Decker, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Leslie; and

A bill (S. 4865) granting an increase of pension to James W. Muncy.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7237) granting an increase of pension to Daniel McConnell; and

A bill (S. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Key.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 7475) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hudson;

A bill (S. 3929) granting an increase of pension to Ellen L. Stoughton;

A bill (S. 7870) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bennington; and

A bill (S. 7531) granting an increase of pension to William F. Letts.

Mr. CARMACK (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 588) granting a pension to Priscilla L. Hamill, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3446) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Woodbury;

A bill (S. 4890) granting an increase of pension to Lorin N. Hawkins;

A bill (S. 2743) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Morehead; and

A bill (S. 5623) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas M. Hawkins.

Mr. CARMACK (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1526) granting an increase of pension to Theodore W. Gates; and

A bill (S. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. White.

#### REPORT ON SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

Mr. PENROSE, from the joint commission of Congress appointed under the act approved June 30, 1906, to investigate, consider, and report, by bill or otherwise, to Congress its findings and recommendations regarding the second class of mail matter, submitted a report thereon.

#### FOUNTAIN AT PADUCAH, KY.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24047) to authorize Chapter No. 376 of the Daughters of the American Revolution to erect a fountain on the property of the United States at Paducah, Ky., to report it favorably without amendment. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] to the bill.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am sure that no one will object to the passage of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to consider it now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DISTRICT STREET RAILWAY FRANCHISES.

Mr. PLATT. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution, and I submit an accompanying report. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,500 copies of the volume entitled "Laws relating to street railway franchises in the District of Columbia, 1905," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies for the use of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ALGER.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. BURROWS on the 25th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the necessary expenses in connection with the funeral of Hon. RUSSEL A. ALGER, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### COURTS IN MISSOURI.

Mr. FORAKER. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24104) transferring Phelps County to the eastern division of the eastern judicial district of Missouri, to report it favorably, and to ask for its present consideration.



The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 8136) to provide for the reservation of the coal, lignite, oil, and natural gas in the public lands, for the leasing of the same, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 8137) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River between the counties of Stearns and Sherburne, in the State of Minnesota," approved June 28, 1906;

A bill (S. 8138) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River in the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota," approved June 4, 1906; and

A bill (S. 8139) to authorize the Pike Rapids Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, its successors or assigns, to construct a dam across the Mississippi River in Morrison County, Minn.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 8140) to provide for the compensation of the appraiser of merchandise at the port of Philadelphia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8141) granting an increase of pension to Mary Webster Lusk; and

A bill (S. 8142) granting an increase of pension to John F. Blanchard.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced a bill (S. 8143) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8144) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Bonner;

A bill (S. 8145) granting an increase of pension to Jane Payne (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8146) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Freeman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8147) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Macy.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 8148) granting a pension to Mary F. Bitely; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 8149) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph W. Baugh, sr., deceased; and

A bill (S. 8150) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church, in Franklin, Williamson County, Tenn.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8151) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bennett; and

A bill (S. 8152) granting an increase of pension to W. F. Fowler.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 8153) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 8154) to regulate embalming in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 8155) to create a commission to inquire into the matter of salaries and compensations of Federal officials and employees, to report to Congress a proposed bill for the purpose of curing inequalities and discrepancies that have arisen in the matter of salaries and compensations of officials and employees, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCUMBER. As the bill is brief and upon a subject of very lively interest, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A bill (S. 8155) to create a commission to inquire into the matter of salaries and compensations of Federal officials and employees, to report to Congress a proposed bill for the purpose of curing inequalities and discrepancies that have arisen in the matter of salaries and compensations of officials and employees, and for other purposes.

Whereas great inequalities and discrepancies have arisen in the matter of salaries and compensations of Government officials and those employed in the several branches of the Government service in substantially the same grade or character of work, or duties requiring the same ability, due in part to the fact that such salaries and discrepancies have been arbitrarily fixed in individual cases and at divers times without any comprehensive standard applicable to all cases of like character; and

Whereas such salaries and compensations were in many cases fixed by law or departmental order many years ago, and at a time when the conditions in respect to the amount and character of labor or duties to be performed and the cost of living differed materially from that of the present, and when salaries and compensations paid in all lines of private business or enterprise differed materially from what is being paid at present: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission composed of three members be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate, not more than two of whom shall belong to the same political party, whose duty it shall be to investigate all such discrepancies and inequalities with a view to the correction thereof, and to report to the Congress on or before the 1st day of January, 1908, a proposed bill for fixing the salaries and compensations of the officials and employees hereinafter mentioned.

In determining the amount of salaries or compensations to be paid any such officials or employees, said commission shall take into consideration the advanced cost of living in places where such official or employee is required to perform his duties or services, the general advance of salaries or compensations for like services in private employment, and the advance in wages or compensations for other classes of services or labor since such salaries or compensations were last fixed by law or otherwise.

Said commission shall accompany such proposed bill with such information and data as it may deem necessary to explain its provisions or recommendations.

In addition to the foregoing duties said commission shall make investigation and report the following:

First. The total number of Federal officials and employees holding positions not of a temporary character.

Second. The total amount of salaries and compensations paid such officials or employees.

Third. The number of employees in each of the Executive Departments in the city of Washington.

Fourth. Of those employees how many are there who may be designated as officials and how many designated as clerks?

Fifth. Of these clerks how many are men and how many are women?

Sixth. Of the men how many are married and how many single?

Seventh. Of the women how many are married and how many are single?

Eighth. In how many instances are both husband and wife employed?

Ninth. In how many instances are there two or more members of the same family employed?—giving number employed in each family.

Tenth. How do the salaries of clerks in the Departments in the city of Washington compare with the salaries of clerks performing like services in other large cities of the country?

Eleventh. How do such salaries compare with the salaries of clerks performing like services in the smaller cities and rural districts of the country?

Salaries and compensations of the following officials and employees shall be considered and provided for under this act:

President of the United States.

Vice-President.

Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney-General, Postmaster-General, Secretary of Navy, Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, commissioners, directors, and heads of the several bureaus.

Members of Supreme Court.

Circuit court of appeals.

Circuit court.

District courts and Territorial courts of the United States.

United States district attorneys, marshals.

Members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Ambassadors, ministers, consuls-general, and consuls.

Officers of the Army and Navy.

Internal-revenue collectors and collectors of customs.

Postmasters of each class and postal clerks.

Rural and city mail carriers.

All officers, clerks, and employees of the several Executive Departments of the Government, both within and without the city of Washington.

Executive officers of the District of Columbia.

Registers and receivers of land offices.

And such other Federal officers or employees as such commission shall deem it advisable to consider hereunder.

The commission, if it deems it advisable, shall give reasonable time for hearings and shall have authority to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and affirmations. All necessary expenses, including clerical and stenographic assistance, printing, and stationery, shall be paid upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the commission.

Any vacancies occurring in the commission by death, disability, or from any other cause shall be filled by appointment by the President.

Said commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum each, and all necessary traveling expenses, to be paid monthly by the proper disbursing officer.

Such commission shall continue for the purpose of furnishing such information as may be required by Congress or either branch thereof until otherwise provided by law.

Twenty-five thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay such salaries and expenses.

Mr. DICK introduced a bill (S. 8156) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Bartlett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 8157) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Coady; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8158) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wade; and

A bill (S. 8159) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Fogle.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 8160) granting a pension to John W. Casebolt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 8161) in relation to salaries of district attorney and assistant district attorneys for the northern district of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, which were ordered to be printed, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8162) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lohr; and

A bill (S. 8163) granting an increase of pension to Jennie P. Douglas.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 8164) granting to the State of Montana 50,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school for the blind; and

A bill (S. 8165) granting to the State of Montana 50,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school for feeble-minded.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 8166) for the relief of Mattie R. West; and

A bill (S. 8167) for the relief of J. D. Eades, sr. (with accompanying papers).

He also introduced a bill (S. 8168) to correct the military record of Solomon B. Saylor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 8169) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the accounts of the Vicksburg, Shreveport and Pacific Railway Company for transporting the United States mails; which was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Shall the bill be referred to the Committee on Claims?

Mr. CARMACK. I do not care. It struck me that it ought to go to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, but let it go to whatever is the appropriate committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer it, with the accompanying paper, to the Committee on Claims; and if the Senator should desire later a different reference it can be made.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 8170) amending an act to create a customs district of the Territory of Arizona, approved April 29, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8171) making an appropriation for the custom-house in San Francisco, Cal., and releasing the contractor to the extent necessary to replace work or materials, and to compensate him for increase in the cost of labor and materials above the prices prevailing previous to April 18, 1906; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 8172) granting a pension to Orlando Robbins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 8173) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 8174) to incorporate a company for breeding horses on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally

read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8175) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Baxter; and

A bill (S. 8176) granting an increase of pension to Jake Holystone (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 8177) for the relief of the president and managers of the Union Society (Bethesda Orphan House) of Savannah, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced a bill (S. 8178) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Partlow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 8179) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Kenneth McAlpine, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8180) to protect the monuments already erected on the battlefields of Bull Run, Va., and other monuments that may be there erected; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8181) authorizing the placing of Capt. Carter P. Johnson, Tenth United States Cavalry, on the retired list, with the rank and pay of a major; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 8182) authorizing the Twin City Power Company to build two dams across the Savannah River above the city of Augusta, in the State of Georgia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Moore; and

A bill (S. 8184) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Kellenberger.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 8185) granting a pension to Elisha Painter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 8186) to construct and place a light-ship at or near Ohio Shoal, Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 8187) for relief of the estate of Rebecca E. Sexton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 8188) authorizing certain changes in the permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 8189) granting to the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company, a corporation, the right to construct, maintain, and operate a single track railway across the lands of the United States in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 14 north, range 6 west of the fifth principal meridian, in the county of Independence and State of Arkansas, reserved for use in connection with the construction of Lock No. 1, Upper White River, Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment granting an extension of time to the homestead settlers on ceded Indian reservations in Minnesota in which to make payments thereon, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That the Public Printer be ordered to print and bind 2,500 copies of the third report of the United States Board on Geographic Names for the use of the Board.

#### CHARLES S. HANKS—RAILROAD STATISTICS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.



The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas according to press accounts Charles S. Hanks, in a recent address delivered before the Boston Chamber of Commerce, said, among other things:

"Since last June I have been at work in Washington at the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I have spent several thousand dollars of the good money of the United States in clerical services to show that the freight and passenger rates of this country can be reduced 10 per cent without affecting the dividends on the stock of any railroad or the wages of any employee. In connection with this work certain other facts have come to my attention which may interest you."

Therefore, be it  
Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed—

1. To inform the Senate whether said Charles S. Hanks is employed in any capacity in connection with said Commission; and if so, in what capacity, by whom employed, and from what appropriation he is paid.

2. To send to the Senate a full statement of the facts found by said Hanks which show or tend to show that the freight and passenger rates can be reduced as stated by him in said address.

Mr. ALDRICH. I would suggest to the Senator from Texas that he add a clause to his resolution calling for the names of all other employees.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not desire that. The resolution is based upon an address delivered by this gentleman in which he stated that he had been at work at the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that there were such facts which had come to his knowledge as he indicated that the rates on passengers and freight could be reduced 10 per cent. This address was delivered before the Chamber of Commerce in the city of Boston, and the purpose of the resolution is to secure those facts, if they have been reported to the Commission, and also to discover the capacity, if any, in which this gentleman served the Commission. I wish to know that in order to see what importance or authority to attach to his findings.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not object at all to the resolution of the Senator from Texas. I think it is quite proper and quite pertinent. But there have been stories floating about that there was a large force employed by somebody in examinations of this character, and I should be glad to have not only the names of the employees, but the information which they have gathered from various sources. I think it is due to us, who are engaged more or less in the work of legislating in this direction, that we should have all the information, especially information which is gathered by Government employees, for our benefit in legislation. Therefore I suggested that perhaps the resolution should be enlarged in its scope.

Mr. CULBERSON. I would have no objection to voting for a resolution submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island covering that point, but I trust he will allow this resolution to be considered this morning and passed.

Mr. HALE. Allow me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The statement made by this man as to what he had been doing and his expending of the Government money in certain directions is quite a remarkable statement, and I think we ought to have information upon that point, how much and for what purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. And from what appropriations?

Mr. HALE. And, as the Senator from Iowa says, from what appropriations. That information can be gotten speedily from the Commission. There is no reason why a reply to this part of it should not be sent to the Senate, so that we may have it during the remnant of the session.

But when the Senator comes to the other proposition, that the Commission shall report upon the great subject of reducing rates 10 per cent, I am afraid if we embody that in the resolution and connect it with the other, we will not get a report from the Interstate Commerce Commission at all during this session, because that will open a very wide door; it will open a new examination and involve a great deal of labor on the part of the Commission.

I do not object to the resolution; I should like to have the report; but I suggest to the Senator whether he had better not divide his resolution and let the resolution that calls for information about the performances of this man stand by itself, so that we can have it very early. I think we ought to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the resolution does not ask the Commission to send here all the facts in its possession on this very important subject, but to send only such as have been collected by this particular official, if he in fact be an official.

Mr. HALE. Will not the Senator read that part of the resolution?

Mr. CULBERSON (reading):

Second. To send to the Senate a full statement of the facts found by said Hanks which show, or tend to show, that the freight and passenger rates can be reduced as stated by him in said address.

It is confined to a report or reports which may have been made to the Commission by Mr. Hanks.

Mr. HALE. I see; I did not observe it on the reading of the resolution at the desk. If that will not so extend the scope of the inquiry and investigation of the Commission that we can not get it all at an early day, as we ought to have it, I think the resolution is right. We ought to have the information. A statement of that kind ought to be known to Congress and the facts ought to be sent here. If the Senator does not think that calling, as the resolution does, for what this man has brought out will delay an answer to the resolution, I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall not object to the resolution, but it seems to me this man has been a very industrious individual, if since last June he has made investigations that enable him to say that the rates for freight and passenger traffic on all the railroads of the United States can be reduced 10 per cent. It is a most remarkable statement for any man to make. I have no idea that he has ascertained anything of the kind, and yet it may be well enough for us to see what this Mr. Hanks has discovered.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not know Mr. Hanks personally, but I have heard something of his employment. My impression is that he is not employed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that he is not paid from their appropriations, but paid from the appropriations for either the Department of Justice or the Department of Commerce and Labor. If I am right in that supposition, the resolution of the Senator from Texas will fail of results, as he makes inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I would suggest that he will probably come nearer getting the information on both subjects if he asks the question of the President of the United States.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I have no special knowledge of this matter except as gleaned from the newspapers. This gentleman is reported to have said:

Since last June I have been at work in Washington at the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I do not know exactly what he means; and the purpose of the resolution is to find out where he is working, by whom he is employed, and what facts he has ascertained in the inquiry made by him.

I trust that there will be no objection to the consideration and passage of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS AND RESERVED STATE RIGHTS.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Thursday, January 31, after the completion of the routine morning business I will, with the permission of the Senate, call up Senate resolution 199, on the question of executive usurpation, for the purpose of submitting some remarks.

#### INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7034) to incorporate the International Sunday School Association of America, which were, on page 2, line 7, after "real," to insert "estate not exceeding \$1,000,000 in value in the aggregate;" and on page 4, after line 3, to insert "Sec. 9. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is reserved."

Mr. McCREARY. I move that the Senate concur in the two amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 16944) to amend section 878 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 24285. An act to provide for holding terms of United States courts at Clarksdale, Miss., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 24603. An act to authorize the Atlanta, Birmingham and Atlantic Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Coosa River in the State of Alabama, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE AT SHEPHERDSTOWN, W. VA.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 24111) to authorize the Norfolk and Western

Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Potomac River, at or near Shepherdstown, W. Va.

I will state, by permission, that a bill almost similar has passed the Senate and gone to the House, and this bill has passed the House and come to the Senate. The only difference is that, under the operation of this bill, the company must commence the construction of the bridge in one year, while under the other in two years. The Senate bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill. I am very glad not to object to its consideration, but I hope that after it is disposed of the consideration of no further bills will be asked, as I wish to make my remarks.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I am sure it will take no time.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### COAL-LAND ENTRIES IN ALASKA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, at the last session I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 17415) to authorize the assignees of coal-land locations to make entry under the coal-land laws applicable to Alaska was passed. I should like now to call up that motion, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be now recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPOONER. I now move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin is that a bill affecting coal lands in Alaska?

Mr. SPOONER. It is.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then ought it not to be referred to the Committee on Territories?

Mr. SPOONER. I think not. It was reported by the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Committee on Territories are now considering a bill on that subject.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SPOONER. It is by the courtesy of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], as I understand, that I obtained the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Then does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, if this matter is going to lead to debate, I shall withdraw my suggestion; but I wish to call attention to the fact as being important, though I shall not press it at this time, that such laws as exist in reference to mining and to coal mines and coal lands in Alaska already have been considered by the Committee on Territories. We now have before our committee for consideration, and shall undoubtedly at the next meeting report out, a bill affecting that very subject. It seems to me that we ought to have this matter concentrated in some committee.

Mr. SPOONER. As an original proposition, that perhaps might be true, but the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana comes on the last day, after the settlement. The truth is that this bill came from the House of Representatives after having been considered by the Committee on Public Lands; it was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Public Lands here, was considered and amended by that committee, and it was committed to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], a member of that committee, to report it to the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I withdraw my suggestion. Let it go this time; but do not do it again.

Mr. SPOONER. I now move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the matter go over, unless we are going to take time enough now to determine what committee is to consider this measure and other bills of this class. If there is any class of legislation that should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining, it seems to me it is that pertaining to coal mines and other classes of mining. All such bills should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining. The Committee on Public Lands is constituted primarily for the consideration of matters pertaining to the public domain other than mining matters. It seems to me, I repeat, that this should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think, as the Senator from Wisconsin states, that this bill ought to go now to the Committee on Public Lands, as that committee practically already has it in charge. Otherwise I should insist on its going to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. SPOONER. I may say, Mr. President, that my motion—if the Senator from Indiana will pardon me a moment—is that this bill go to the Committee on Public Lands, that they may consider in connection with it, it being a House bill, the recommendation made by the President, which involves the public-land service as well as the coal and other nonmineral phases of the subject. I think my friend from Idaho had better make the point hereafter as to other measures which are more exclusively and palpably within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Mines and Mining, if he will pardon the suggestion.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it has been my intention for some time to see if I could not induce the Senate to believe that all questions relative to the mining of coal, iron, or the precious or valuable metals should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining. It was because of the very suggestions made by the Senator that I rose to make the remarks that I have made.

The message of the President referred to by the Senator, I take it, is the one which recommends the leasing of coal lands. That means the leasing of the right to extract the coal. That is mining. So far as the surface of the land under which the coal may lie is concerned, I would not think it important that that branch of the matter should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining; but when it pertains to the question strictly in regard to the mining of coal, I think that committee should begin now to have jurisdiction of every measure that comes here involving the question of extracting the useful or valuable metals or substances from the soil. That is mining.

Mr. SPOONER. Bills have been pending before the Committee on Public Lands which are intended to enable the Government to retain, in the public interests, a certain control over the mining of coal, without interfering at all with the development of the public-land States so far as the surface is concerned, contemplating the disposition of the surface for agricultural purposes, but reserving to the Government the right as to the disposition of the coal and oil and similar nonmineral substances or deposits. That, of course, covers mining, not in the technical sense in which the Senator refers to it, but incidentally; and it covers also the surface. So it seems to me an entirely proper thing that this bill should go to the Committee on Public Lands. It is the committee which, without objection from the Committee on Mines and Mining, took jurisdiction of it and dealt with it, and I am simply moving to send it back to the committee whence it came, in order that they may reconsider it, and also consider in connection with it the bills introduced by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and other Senators, which involve the disposition of the surface, which would not be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Mines and Mining, and, incidentally, the other phases of the subject.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I would inquire of the Senator is it not a fact that this bill went to the Committee on Public Lands before the President presented to the Senate, in a message now upon our table, the question of leasing the coal lands?

Mr. SPOONER. But it does not contain anything now that it did not when it went there, and the Senator did not object to it going there.

Mr. HEYBURN. It did not seem necessary at that time to object to the reference, because the bill did not involve the question of mining. But I will suggest to the Senator that, if the bill is reported again along the lines suggested in the President's message in regard to the leasing of these lands, it should have incorporated in it every feature necessary to pro-



vide for the safety of miners working in the mines, for the method of mining, the limitations, and everything pertaining to the manner of mining. That belongs to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it must be apparent to the Senate that this bill ought to go to the committee whence it came, and that my motion is the proper motion.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this bill came from the Committee on Public Lands of the other House and was considered by the Committee on Public Lands of this body. It involves not only the matter of mining, but what disposition is to be made of the surface lands. In that view of the case, I think, under present contingencies, the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, whence it came.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF CHILD LABOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill indicated by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I began my remarks on last Wednesday by showing the appalling figures of the official census concerning child labor in the United States and by showing further that, startling as these figures are, they are far below the truth. I gave some items of this kind, of which perhaps the most conclusive were the census figures from Maryland, where something over 5,000 children were reported, and where, under the new law, already, within six months, children to more than twice the census figures are shown to be working in that State. This is proved by the following affidavit from the assistant chief of the bureau of statistics and information of the State of Maryland, which I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MARYLAND BUREAU OF STATISTICS AND INFORMATION,  
Baltimore, Md., January 24, 1907.

This is to certify that the Maryland bureau of statistics and information has, since July 1, issued upward of 10,000 permits to work to children between 12 and 16 years of age, who could pass the test of reading and writing simple sentences in the English language, working in the stores, offices, workshops, and manufacturing establishments of this State. That the said office has rejected application for permits of about 1,200 children who were disqualified either by ignorance or physical disability.

J. G. SCHONFARBER,  
Assistant to Chief, Bureau of Statistics.

STATE OF MARYLAND,  
City of Baltimore, to wit:

Be it remembered that on this 24th day of January, 1907, before the subscriber, a justice of the peace in and for the State of Maryland and Baltimore City, personally appeared J. G. Schonfarber, and made oath in due form of law that the foregoing statement is true.

[SEAL.] OSCAR C. MARTENET,  
Justice of the Peace.

#### CENSUS GIVES ONLY OVER 10 YEARS OF AGE.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, another proof of the inadequacy of the census figures is the fact that they do not assume to give any children employed under the age of 10. The census enumerators were not instructed to return children under 10. I showed on last Wednesday that a vast number of children, giving, as examples, names, places, and ages, in the glass factories of New Jersey and of West Virginia and on the coal breakers of Pennsylvania and elsewhere were at work below 10 years of age. Before I am through with the presentation of the evidence in this case—because that is what it amounts to, evidence in a case—I shall show that large numbers elsewhere, particularly in the cotton mills of the South, are at work, some of them at an age as low as 5 years; that in the sweatshops of some of the Northern States children are at work at an age as low as 3 years. Yet few, if any, of these were included in the census figures and none were sought for. I give this by way of recapitulation.

Now I shall continue Mr. Durland's testimony. I presented his affidavit last Wednesday as to the truth of all he says.

Mr. President, I may further state, for the benefit of those who on last Wednesday afternoon during our session were absent at luncheon, that I am sustaining each statement made as to facts by the affidavit of the person who investigated them. I am not taking the course usually taken in the Senate of merely making statements that have been set forth in magazines or newspapers or heard by somebody, but I am supporting them all by affidavit; and I am doing this because I know that every fact in support of this great reform will be questioned, if not

denied, just as every proposition of law will at first be declared to be heresy.

It is said that certain interests are even now at work opposing this bill. Three-fourths of the cotton factories of the Southern States are determined that it shall be defeated—not all of them, Mr. President, for, I thank God, there are some mill owners in the South who would rather have less money and more conscience, who employ children only because their competitors do, and who pray for the passage of this bill. But it is safe to say that three-quarters of that tremendous industry, the extent of which you may see by looking at the map on my left, will resist this measure—are resisting right now.

It is said that the great Southern Railway system, which is set out on the map in red and a large part of whose business and a good fraction of whose profits come from these cotton mills, is also against this or any similar reform. It is said that the enormous coal industries of Pennsylvania, as shown on the map farther toward the door, with their immense power, and the railroads that gridiron that portion of the State and that carry the product of those mines—the Pennsylvania, the Lehigh Valley, the Delaware and Lackawanna, and the Delaware and Hudson—will also oppose it.

And these are not all. As this debate proceeds if it becomes necessary, indeed, if I have time and the geographer has time, other maps will be presented showing the location of other industries and the extent of other interests which will fight this great reform.

Therefore I tell Senators who were at luncheon the other day that I am supporting what is here presented by the oath of the person who made the investigation. I intend to continue this morning at some length in completing the case as to the evidence.

I intended to take, Mr. President, a good deal of time, because we are told that this whole matter was a vast exaggeration, that the extent of child labor is not nearly so great as earnest and sympathetic persons were stating it to be, and that the allegations of cruelty were not borne out by the facts.

So, the first thing necessary is to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country, and to repeat and repeat to the point of iteration, *the facts in the case*, every one of them being susceptible of *proof in a court of justice*. Then, when the facts are before us and the country knows the extent of this infamy and what it means now and in the future, we will have a sound basis upon which to act. And the country can judge us if we do not act.

I see some Senators here who were not here the other day when I read Mr. Lovejoy's statement from the Outlook. I suppose it is not necessary for me to say that, in the absence of an affidavit, any article printed in the Outlook carries weight with the American people, because it has the personal indorsement of its editor, that great American moralist and publicist known and honored by all the civilized world, Dr. Lyman Abbott. But I have not even depended on that; I support every statement by the oath of the person who makes it.

#### ANOTHER DESCRIPTION OF THE BREAKERS.

Now I shall read a few of the concrete illustrations; and since we have been on the subject of the coal breakers of Pennsylvania, concerning which I read at considerable length last Wednesday, perhaps we had better complete that. But before I do, Mr. President, I wish to read one sentence from an editorial in the New York Sun of last Friday, entitled, "Mr. Beveridge on good and bad States." It is not necessary to read the whole editorial—I will try to answer fully later on its arguments against this bill—but this particular sentence from the Sun's editorial should be read at this juncture and borne in mind by every Senator and every American, as I read the descriptions, sworn to, of the child labor this bill will abolish. The New York Sun, speaking of these children this bill is intended to rescue and arguing against the bill itself says:

It is likely enough that many of these child laborers will grow up into capitalists and become "too rich," like their present oppressors—

That is the opinion of that paper. As I read the condition of these children in the coal breakers of Pennsylvania, in the cotton mills of the South, in the cotton mills of Maine, in the glass works of West Virginia, and in the sweatshops of New Jersey you will see the material out of which our future "capitalists," according to this paper, are to be made. Here is Mr. Durland's description of the breakers:

When the coal comes up out of the mines it is sent to the towering breakers and run through a series of sifting and sorting troughs, astride of which the boys sit, their little backs bent over the streams of moving coal, as with their bare hands they pick the stone and refuse from the good coal. The fingers soon become scarred and calloused and their nails worn or broken to the quick. The breaker atmosphere becomes impenetrable. Fine particles of coal dust fill the air and are taken into the lungs with every breath. This is the dark

cloud that hovers like a pall above every dry breaker in the anthracite region.

*The tissues of the boys' lungs gather the black specks until the whole lung is discolored, and I have seen boys who have been away from the breakers and mines for eight and even ten years cough up these particles whenever they were attacked by a slight cold.*

Experiment has shown that the work of the breaker boys can be done by machinery. Automatic slate pickers have been demonstrated to be practicable. Flesh and blood are at present deemed cheaper commodities than iron and steel, and the State permits the boys to do this work at 14.

#### GIRLS WORK IN SILK MILLS OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Now Mr. Durland takes up the silk mills. He says:

Less kindly is the State toward the girls. They may work at 13 years. They may work at *twelve-hour shifts by day or by night*. Their work is often in a warm, moist atmosphere, out of which they pass into the chill dawn of winter mornings. They must stand at their work. They must be unceasingly diligent lest an unnoticed broken strand of silk entangle others and damage the work.

They are unprotected from moral dangers shocking almost beyond credence. The State has refused to protect these children because the abolition of child labor at night would necessitate the remodeling of certain industrial plants, and the citizens of the State bow to the wishes of the manufacturers in this matter as quietly as if it were a moot point, complicated by subtle technicalities. The moral phase of the matter is completely subjugated to the pecuniary.

"I deplore this business as much as you do," a silk-mill owner said to me one day, "but I am part of a great industrial system, and so long as the system exists I must run my mill as other mills are run." The gentleman had come to me to beg that I keep silent on what I had seen in his mill the previous night. The foreman in charge, with more kindness than business discretion, had allowed me to go through the mill with absolute carte blanche. When I saw a small girl whose thin features and lusterless eyes attracted my attention, I asked her age.

"Eleven past, sir," she answered.

"How long have you worked in the mill?"

"Two years."

So she began at 9 years, and in a State right next to us where the law fixes the limit at 13.

Do you always work night shift?—

Night shift, mind you—

Yes, sir; all the time.

A little boy was working over a loom a few feet off.

"How old are you, my boy?" I asked.

"Fourteen past, sir."

I should not have thought him more than 11.

Now, let us see the conditions under which they are working. Of course these are not *our* children. They are the children of somebody else that are working *twelve hours a night*. If they were *our* children, we would forget lunch and not sit up nights contriving arguments to show that the Constitution won't let us rescue them.

Mr. Durland continues:

The perpetual click of the rattling looms, the whirr of belts, the crunch and rumble of wheels made a deafening din. The looms moved so regularly that I found my eyes easily tired watching them. It needed only a few moments of fixed gazing to appreciate the story told by one little girl who had had to quit the mill.

I ask the attention of every Senator in the Chamber to this, because it is typical. Said this child:

"The tangles were always worst when I was tiredest. I had to twist back the reel for a long, long time until all the tangles were gone. The big girl who had charge of our department often scolded me, and sometimes the man who was night superintendent told me he would discharge me if I couldn't do better. Then my head would ache something awful, and I would have to cry, and some other girl would straighten out the tangle."

Another one employed in a mill near Scranton, who had been transferred to day shift, said:

"When I first went to work at night the long standing hurt me very much. My feet burned so that I cried. My knees hurt me worse than my feet, and my back pained all the time."

I stop here to remark that this is no occasional instance. It is typical and common.

Mother cried when I told her how I suffered, and that made me feel so badly that I did not tell her any more. It does not hurt me so much now, but I feel tired all the time. I do not feel near as tired, though, as I did when I worked all night.

My eyes hurt me, too, from watching the threads at night. The doctor said they would be ruined if I did not stop the night work. After watching the threads for a long time I could see threads everywhere—

A little girl 9 years old, mind you, went through this—

When I looked at other things there were threads running across them. Sometimes I felt as though the threads were cutting my eyes.

No wonder. She had been working twelve hours at night, looking at the ceaseless play of the threads; she was 9 years old; she had been standing on her feet; and this is going on in a country about which we make earnest and passionate Fourth-of-July orations.

But Mr. Durland says that—

Bad as this aspect is, there is another, a sadder and more terrible feature. The close atmosphere of the factory rooms in the dead of night tends to stupefy the children. To freshen them and drive the natural drowsiness away they are encouraged to spend their midnight half hour running in the open air.

Mark that humanity. The silk mills really give the children a half hour for luncheon at midnight. I hope American women

will think of all these things when they put on their silks. Mr. Durland goes on:

The mills usually occupy isolated sites. They are often on the edge of a mining village, sometimes by the banks of the Susquehanna, or near the foot of the hills. Open fields and shadowy woods surround them.

And then occurs a statement which I prefer not to read, but which every Senator will quickly infer.

I shall read from another article in the Outlook. The affidavit is among my papers here some place. I assure Senators I have it. It will be presented and will appear in the Record. This is a continuation of the description of this evil. Here is the affidavit, and I ask that it be read from the Clerk's desk:

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Rev. Peter Roberts, Ph. D., of Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania, appeared before me this day, February 5, 1907, and, being duly sworn, affirms that the facts, conversations, and interviews as set forth in his article on the question of "Child Labor in Eastern Pennsylvania," which appeared in the Outlook, a weekly magazine published in New York City, the issue of December 7, 1904, are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

REV. PETER ROBERTS, Ph. D.,  
517 E. Center Street, Mahanoy City, Pa.

Sworn to before me this 5th day of February, A. D. 1907.

[SEAL.]

ROBT. W. WYATT,  
Justice of the Peace.

My commission expires first Monday in May, 1910.

#### MORE EXAMPLES OF GIRLS' WORK IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Says Doctor Roberts:

Ten or fifteen years ago night work for girls was unknown in this State—

This is Pennsylvania—

Ten or fifteen years ago night work for girls was unknown in this State. The evil arose when the silk-throwing plants were built in anthracite communities; and as these enterprises multiply, the number of tender children employed at night increases.

So you see we are not talking about something that is old. We are talking about a new and increasing evil. If the census figures showing 750,000 children at work in other occupations than agriculture be correct—and I have shown that they are far beneath the truth—the increase since 1900 would make to-day over 1,500,000 children engaged in something else than agriculture.

Says Doctor Roberts:

A plant in Dickson City, employing some 300 hands, draws its labor supply from a radius of 2 miles, and young girls not 16 years of age work twelve hours for five nights in the week. When an employer was asked "Do they work as well by night as by day?" he answered, "No; they don't sleep in the day, and when midnight comes they get drowsy."

How extraordinary! *Children working on their feet all night get drowsy! How indolent of the children—*

"and the waste is larger." I saw little girls going to and fro before scores of revolving spindles, having their short dresses tied with a cord to keep them from being entangled in the machinery as they stretched on tiptoe to catch the broken thread.

And these little girls in short dresses, standing before these whirlers—some of them making 25,000 revolutions a minute—from 6 p. m. to 6 a. m., get drowsy. It means more waste—the waste of nerve and tissue of future mothers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Future mothers, you know, of the "capitalists" of the New York Sun's prophecy.

I shall refer to the book again upon another phase of the subject.

#### MR. NICHOLS'S ACCOUNT OF THE BREAKERS.

Now I will read the only article I shall read which will not be supported by an affidavit, and the reason of that is that the writer is dead. It is an article entitled "Children of the Coal Shadow," by Francis H. Nichols, in McClure's. He also adds his testimony to Mr. Lovejoy's, Mr. Durland's, and Mr. Spargo's about the work of boys on breakers and just what that work means:

After being ground in heavy machinery in the cupola of the breaker, the broken coal flows down a series of chutes to the ground floor, where it is loaded on freight cars waiting to receive it. The chutes zigzag through the building, about 3 feet apart. Between them, in tiers, are nailed a series of planks; these serve as seats for the "slate pickers." Mixed with the coal are pieces of slate rock, which it is the duty of the slate picker to detect as they pass him and to throw into another chute which passes to the refuse heap below.

A few of the slate pickers are white-haired old men, superannuated or crippled miners who are no longer able to blast coal below ground, and who, for the sake of a dollar a day, pass their last years in the breaker; but an overwhelming majority in all the breakers are boys. All day long their little fingers dip into the unending grimy stream that rolls past them.

The coal so closely resembles slate that it can be detected only by the closest scrutiny, and the childish faces are compelled to bend so low over the chutes that prematurely round shoulders and narrow chests are the inevitable result. In front of the chutes is an open space reserved for the "breaker boss"—

Senators who heard the evidence given the other day will remember that both Mr. Spargo and Mr. Lovejoy testified that the boss sat some distance back with a stick in his hand and



occasionally, with a piece of slate or coal, spurred the boys on to greater effort. "By a multitude of witnesses," says the Bible—

In front of the chutes is an open space reserved for the "breaker boss," who watches the boys as intently as they watch the coal.

The boss is armed with a stick, with which he occasionally raps on the head and shoulders a boy who betrays lack of zeal. This is in America, you know.

The breakers are supposed to be heated in winter, and a steam pipe winds up the wall, but in cold weather every pound of steam is needed in the mines, so that the amount of heat that radiates from the steam pipe is not sufficient to be taken seriously by any of the breakers' toilers.

From November until May a breaker boy always wears a cap and tippet and overcoat, if he possesses one, but because he has to rely largely upon the sense of touch he can not cover his finger tips with mittens or gloves. From the chafing of the coal his fingers sometimes bleed, and his nails are worn down to the quick.

The hours of toil for slate pickers are supposed to be from 7 in the morning until noon and from 1 to 6 in the afternoon; but when the colliery is running on "full-capacity orders" the noon recess is reduced to half an hour, and the good-night whistle does not blow until half past 6. For his eleven hours' work the breaker boy gets no more pay than for ten.

Mr. CARMACK. About what are the ages of these boys?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator evidently was not here Wednesday. I have not attempted to recapitulate all that testimony. I then read an article supported by the affidavit of Mr. Lovejoy, giving the names and ages of the children. They range all the way from 8 years up to 14 years, all of that being a violation of law; and I am coming to the age.

The writer goes on and describes how difficult it is to get any of them to say anything about it, because they think it is the inspector perhaps, or something of that kind, and they do not want to betray their fraudulent certificates. But he got into communication with the boys through a labor union.

For this reason my inquiries of mine boys as to their work and ages were always conducted under the sacred auspices of the union.

The interrogative colloquy was invariably something like this:

"How old are you?"

Boy. "Thirteen, going on 14."

SECRETARY OF THE LOCAL. "On the level, now, this is union business. You can speak free, understand."

Boy. "Oh, dat's a diffrent t'ing altogether. I'm 9 years old. I've been working since my fadder got hurted in th' explosion in No. 17 a year ago last October."

A system of compulsory registration of births, such as exists in most of the other States of the Union, might settle the question of the ages of the children, but, strangely enough, such does not exist in the State of Pennsylvania. Without some such source of evidence, notaries and inspectors, knowing to a moral certainty the perjury, can prove nothing.

I send to the desk and ask to have read an affidavit. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this affidavit is made by a school-teacher now living and teaching in Washington, who taught a school near one of the breakers and later on taught a school in New Jersey, and she made personal observations concerning the facts to which she testifies.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, United States of America, ss:

Miss Olive G. Murphy personally appeared before me, a notary public, who on oath says she has taught in the public schools of Dickson City, Pa., a town 6 miles from Scranton, Pa.

During the strike the breaker boys came to her primary school. She then realized how little these boys had been in school.

They were between 9 and 12 years of age, and were in a class of children 6 and 7 years of age. The breaker boys were not able to read in the first reader or write their names, which proved to her that they had been working before the age limit.

The boys not only lost the education which is due to them, but their health was impaired by breathing the coal dust, injuring their lungs; working in darkness, injuring their eyes; position while working, giving them cramped bodies.

She has lived in Scranton and has seen the home life, which told her that school was the only place where the miner's child could receive an education to fit him to become an American citizen.

She saw in Paterson, N. J., at Barber's linen mill, the small girls outside with wet clothing, as if they had been out in the pouring rain. The work in this mill is not fit for any child, especially the small girls who work there.

OLIVE G. MURPHY.

Subscribed and sworn to this 25th day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS,  
Notary Public.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I send to the desk and ask to have read another affidavit.

CHILD LABOR IN MAINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

I, Arthur F. Cushman, of Auburn, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, on oath say that the facts stated in the article appearing in the Lewiston Evening Journal, of Lewiston, Me., on Saturday, June 16, 1906, entitled "Child Labor in the Lewiston Mills," and signed by me, were at that time true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

And I, on oath, do further say that the facts stated in the article appearing in the Maine Magazine of November, 1906, entitled "Child

Slaves of Maine," and written by me, were at that time true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that the photographs appearing in said last-mentioned article were taken by me under the conditions described therein.

ARTHUR F. CUSHMAN.

LEWISTON, January 10, 1907.

STATE OF MAINE, Androscoggin, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me.

[SEAL.]

RALPH W. CROCKETT, Notary Public.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The extract which I wish to read from Mr. Cushman's article in the Maine Magazine is as follows:

There are 2,000 children, 14 years of age and under, working in the cotton and woolen mills and shops of Maine. That is my estimate, made after careful consideration of the data I have myself gathered. It is substantiated by the investigations of half a dozen honest men and women who have thrown their time, energy, and means into the work. Indeed, the labor unions constitute the only body of men who have presented a consistent front against this slaughter of children's tender bodies and innocent souls.

Two thousand children!

This number is constantly increasing. The increase is more noticed in the number of girls employed.

Over half of these attend no school throughout the year. Some of them, even as young as 11 years of age, have spent their last day in school.

Lewiston and Auburn alone furnish three-quarters of a thousand of these unfortunate children, and a more sickly, pinched, dull-eyed, and colorless cheeked gathering of little tots can not be found outside our hospitals.

An attempt has been made by the mill managements in times past to deny these facts and figures, but in the face of the evidence I have at my disposal they dare not now repeat that denial over their own signatures.

There was, I believe, a denial of some of these statements, and almost at the same time the Lewiston Journal of April 16, 1906, published a description of the killing of Francis Russell, who was a boy of 11 years of age working in the mill. There was no denying that boy's age. I have the Lewiston Journal's account of the accident.

Mr. Cushman published in the Lewiston Journal a rather extensive article, from which I extract merely the bare statements of fact. He says:

It is not my purpose to make any statements here that can not be substantiated by the actual data in black and white, which I have at my disposal. After perhaps the most careful investigation regarding child labor ever made in this community, an investigation covering nine months of persistent effort, from June, 1905, to March of the present year, an investigation that has brought me into close touch with the home life, the street life, and the mill life of these children of poverty, an investigation itself following nearly three years of careful, open-minded observation—after all this I am prepared to say that here in Lewiston, in five of these million-dollar cotton mills, human lives are being blotted and crushed, human ambitions are being stifled and drowned, human souls are being starved, poisoned, destroyed, not because these children are not smart, not because they are not good, not because they are not willing to work, but because mill owners must have their dividends, mill owners must grind their dividends out of the flesh and blood, out of the intellects and souls, not of grown men, not always even of women, but of children.

Starting with the summer vacation for 1905, a systematic division of territory, a careful study of conditions and subsequent laying of plans occupied the time through the rest of June and through July to the 1st of August. I have thought it best to observe absolute secrecy in pursuing this work.

This has been a success. It has allowed me to associate with mill help with never a suspicion of my purpose. I have entered into their lives; I have studied them, their motives, their incentives; I have won their confidences.

Beginning with August I visited in succession each of the upward of thirty mill gates, some of them twice and some three times. At these gates, while the help were passing in and out, I have taken a "census."

It should be borne in mind that these figures are without value, almost, unless I have been able to tell pretty nearly, upon casual observation, about how old a mill child is. I would only say that I have cultivated the acquaintance of these children for what is now over three years. You have passed a law that no cigarettes shall be sold to boys under 14 years of age, and you leave it with the dealer to estimate the ages of his youthful customers. You allow no liquors to be sold to minors, but you leave it with the city liquor agent to guess how old his applicants are. With fully as much care and discrimination—with, perhaps, even more care and discrimination—I have estimated the ages of these child workers as they have passed before me, in and out of their daytime prisons. I may have made mistakes, perhaps serious mistakes, but I have made generous allowances, and as I review the results of these nine months of work I fully believe that if my figures are far from correct, it is because they are too low rather than too high.

Then he proceeds to give the mills in detail and the gates by numbers and the children and the ages of the children found at each, and that, of course, is too long either to have read or to spread at length in the RECORD. The summary is what we care about.

Now, the figures given above indicate about 467 boys and girls seemingly under 15 years old employed during vacations in the public schools. Figures do not tell the story of tired eyes, wasted, pinched bodies, drooping heads, and dragging feet. We may say that there are very nearly or quite half a thousand of these children laborers, and yet the meaning of these statistics will hardly dawn upon us. Out of all of them, as they have passed before me, I doubt if I could have picked out half a hundred of them whom I would not place under a doctor's care were they children of mine. Whether this widespread anamia, which often ends in consumption, is due to sustained overwork, which no child's stomach is able to make up in nourishment, or whether it is

due to undernourishment from cheap or adulterated food which it is ever the lot of the children of the poverty stricken to eat, I do not care to say.

I will state the situation as I, personally, have found it. However, the mortality among these children must be great. I have heard United States statistics quoted to the effect that the average child under 15 who goes to work in the mill averages to live but five years, but have been unable to get a copy of these figures. Doctors who practice in southern mill districts, where hours are longer, place the average at three or four years. In Maine, where the hours of work are only eleven a day and where the climate is colder and dryer, the children would live much longer than this on the average. Many of them live to raise families. But what children are theirs?

Returning again to the facts that I, personally, have been witness to, I desire to state further that the 467 boys and girls given in the above table are about one-half of the actual number of boys and girls working in the mills who are yet, as we may say, in short trousers or short dresses.

The rest of this article I shall refer to on the question of the nonenforcement of law when I come to that topic.

#### THE CHILDREN OF FOREIGNERS.

Thus far, Mr. President, these items, uninteresting perhaps to Senators, but of infinite consequence to this nation, have concerned foreign children more than American children. The names which I read the other day in Mr. Lovejoy's article indicated that they were foreigners, that they were Slavs and Italians and Hungarians. (This extract is inserted hereafter under head of "Nonenforcement of Laws.") Anybody who has made a study of the situation knows that this is also true in the New England States. In Maine, in New Hampshire, in Vermont, immense numbers of foreigners—French, Russians, Canadians, and Slavs—have gone into the mill towns and are at work.

But that does not decrease my sympathy, if I was taking this up as a matter of sympathy, which I am not. I am interested in this matter not only from the point of view of sympathy for these children, but for the future of this Republic. All of us have seen growing within the last ten or fifteen years a class which men of all parties concede to be very dangerous to free institutions; and that that class shall not increase as it is now increasing, but that it shall be exterminated is the chief concern in the consideration of this bill.

But even if it were only sympathy, my sympathy is as broad for the child of the foreign immigrant as it is for the child of an American.

Mr. President, the children of foreigners, if they have a chance, make admirable American citizens. I wish every Senator who doubts this might read a remarkable article in the American Magazine some three months ago, entitled "A mother of Americans," and citing merely the cold facts without adornment. It told of how a young Lithuanian woman and her husband had gone to Chicago, and described the magnificent children they reared and the splendid citizens of this Republic which these "foreign" parents' sacrifice and toil and love of liberty, which brought them to this country, had produced in their children.

"Foreigners?" I suppose we were all "foreigners" once. I have no patience with the narrow view that some of us monopolize all the real and original humanity of the world. These people who come here make in the course of one generation admirable citizens if their bodies are not broken and their souls are not crushed and their minds are not stunted in the meantime. And when you do that to any children, whether they are Americans or "foreigners," you have spoiled citizenship and ruined human life.

But now, Mr. President, I come to a section of the country where this evil is greatest and most shameful and where it is practiced upon the purest American strain that still exists in this country—the children in the southern cotton mills, to whom I am now going to call the attention of the Senate. I am sorry that so few Senators upon the other side of the Chamber are interested in this question. I should like them to hear it. The evil is practiced in these States upon children who are the unadulterated, unmixed "American," the pure Scotch-Irish, whose fathers fought at Guilford Court House and Cowpens and followed Marion to victory.

Their blood has never been adulterated from that day to this. Every sociological investigator testifies that those southern children of this origin are capable of infinite development. But the children are not being developed. The mills are being "developed." I shall show you by the actual testimony of personal investigators that instead of being developed, these children are being ruined by the tens of thousands.

#### CHILD LABOR IN SOUTHERN COTTON MILLS.

First, Mr. President, I shall read from an article in World's Work. World's Work is another one of the publications which can not be classed with those publications as to which I quoted an opponent of child-labor legislation as calling them, in vast contempt, "them there magazines." All these magazines are

very high class, which do not accept anything that they do not have reason to believe is accurate.

I have not been able to procure the affidavit of Miss Ashby, who wrote this article, because she is now married to an English officer and at present lives in South Africa. But I will procure it before the debate terminates, if the letter can get to the interior of South Africa by that time. She went south as an investigator of the American Federation of Labor, and I shall present in concluding, when I sum up the testimony in this case, her article in the American Federationist, illustrated by pictures, so that Senators who doubt, so that Senators who think that words too lurid are being used, can with their own eyes take the testimony of the photographic lens as to what those children look like and what kind of a looking woman this sweet-souled investigator is. I shall exclude from this, as from all other articles, everything except merely the definite, detailed description of the fact.

Miss Ashby says:

Walking up the long, orderly building, deafened by the racket, yet fascinated by ingenious machinery, you become suddenly aware of a little gray shadow flitting restlessly up and down the aisles—a small girl, and with bare feet and pale face. She has a worn and anxious aspect, as if a weight of care and responsibility rested already on her baby shoulders. She either does not look at you at all or she turns her eyes but for a moment, unchildlike in their lack of interest, looking back immediately to the spinning frame.

A thread breaks first at one end of the long frame, then at the other. The tiny fingers repair the damage at the first place and she walks listlessly to the other. Something goes wrong above, and the child pushes forward a box to stand on that she may reach it. With a great shock it dawns on you that this child is working.

This is a scene with which I became too painfully familiar ever to forget or to misrepresent. During the latter half of December, 1900, and the first half of January, 1901, I visited twenty-four cotton mills in sixteen cities and villages of Alabama. I chose Alabama because the industry, although comparatively new there (only four out of the twenty-four mills I went through averaging more than five years' existence), is in an active stage of growth, and a child-labor bill had been pending before the legislature.

It was defeated after a severe fight, and the present law, which is practically no law at all, was put on the statute books. Miss Ashby continues:

I was prepared to find child labor, for wherever easily manipulated machinery takes the place of human muscles the child is inevitably drawn into the labor market, unless there are laws to protect it. But one could hardly be prepared to find in America to-day white children, 6 and 7 years of age, working for twelve hours a day—aroused before daybreak and toiling till long after sundown, in winter, with only half an hour for rest and refreshment.

That is what is going on in the South, as I shall show by scores of actual examples, giving the definite description of the children, how old they were, where they worked, and how they looked, all given under oath.

When the mills are tempted by pressure of work they make the same old mistakes of their industrial ancestry.

Their industrial ancestors I am going to refer to at some length. They were the English. This infamy began in England a hundred and some years ago, but England began to reform it a hundred years ago, although, even then, too late.

Some of them run the machinery at night, and the little children are called on to endure the strain of all-night work—

I would not read the following if I did not have another witness to this fact—

and are sometimes kept awake by the vigilant superintendent with cold water dashed into their faces. I should hardly have believed it had I not seen those things myself.

One evening in December I stumbled through a totally unlighted mill village, falling by the way into ditches and deep ruts, and knocked at the door of one of the wooden huts where I saw a light. I asked the woman who opened it if I might come in. Assenting, she ushered me in. She was surrounded by a brood of very small boys, and her consumptive husband sat beside the fire. The smallest child, a poor little fellow that looked to be about 6 years old, nestled up to me as I talked to them. All worked in the mill except the mother, they told me.

"Not this one!" I exclaimed, looking down at the wee, thin boy beside me.

"Why, yes." He had worked for about a year; last year he worked forty nights; he was nearly 8 years old now. They left that mill because the night work was too hard on the children.

In answer to a query from me, the child said that he could scarcely sleep at all in the daytime.

At one place I heard of children working on the night shift, turned out for some fault at 2 o'clock in the morning, allowed by a compassionate clerk to go to sleep on a bench in the office, as they were afraid to go home.

Ladies told me, too, of a common sight in the mill cottages—children lying face downward on the bed sleeping with exhaustion, just as they had come in from the night shift, too utterly weary even to remove their clothes.

#### ALL THESE ARE "AMERICAN" CHILDREN—NOT "FOREIGNERS."

That is not on the coal breakers of Pennsylvania or in the cotton mills of the North. These are not foreigners' children—Huns and Slavs and Bulgarians. These are American children working in the South to-day.



Continues Miss Ashby:

Often the whole family, except the baby actually in the cradle, is in the mill. Two or three of 8 years or older might be on the pay roll, but the youngest paid worker can get through her "side"—

"Side" is the term by which they measure the pay—

At 10 cents a day—

At 10 cents a day! A child 6 years of age, working *twelve hours, standing on her feet*, at 10 cents a day!

At 10 cents a day—with more ease if she has her little brother of 6 to help her.

I have seen a boy under 4 beginning his life of drudgery by pulling the yarn off bobbins to make bands.

A manager courteously conducting me through the mill would often explain—at some exclamation from me—"these very little ones are not working; they are only helping their brothers and sisters." I accepted the explanation until it dawned on me how numerous were these wee unpaid assistants.

Turning back once more to the purely human aspect of this uncivilized system I would say that no array of facts and figures are needed by those who have seen it in operation. I am familiar with the slums of two continents, but I can say I have never seen a more pitiful sight than the mill children, nor known little ones for whom the outlook was more hopeless.

It is not only that they are pale, shrunken, and bowed—they look as if their brains were hypnotized and their souls paralyzed. A friend of mine in Atlanta, thinking to give some of these little victims a treat, asked a number out to her place in the country and turned them into the woods to play. What was her distress and amazement to find that they did not know what the word or the thing meant.

American children, not foreigners like in Pennsylvania and in New England, but American children in the Southern States that do not know what "to play" means. I shall quote from this book some more when I come to an examination of the impossibility of the States handling this evil.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a cablegram.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smoot in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator from Indiana in what State the condition to which he refers as to age exists?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will describe it very definitely. There is a map [indicating] where you see the Southern Railroad with little black dots on the map. The little black dots represent cotton factories which have grown up along the line of that road, and they honeycomb the States of Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. They also exist elsewhere—everywhere, more or less. The things that I have now been reading from were from Alabama, and what I shall immediately read from are Georgia; and on a little later I shall present some affidavits from North Carolina and South Carolina. I have spent one day on Pennsylvania and some of the other places in the North where, without using a word that is too strong, the crushing of these children is given, notwithstanding it is excused upon the ground that they are the children of foreigners. In the Southern States they are not the children of foreigners, and when I get to that part of my argument I am going to call the serious attention of Southern Senators to a future for the South which this very evil is now creating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Cablegram.]

PARIS, January 21, 1907.

Senator BEVERIDGE, Washington:

Ready swear accuracy child-labor articles Post.

VAN VORST.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall now read illustrations of what exists in the South, written in a remarkable series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post, of Philadelphia, from Mrs. Van Vorst's personal investigations. I tried to get her affidavit, as I got the affidavit of the rest of the witnesses from whom I read, but she is now in Paris. So she was cabled as to whether she would make the affidavit, and she has sent back the cablegram you have just heard, that she is willing to make affidavit to the truth of every one of the statements that are here made. She says:

#### A SOUTHERN "MILL TOWN."

Anyone who has visited a mill town knows the deserted aspect of its streets during the daytime. Had it not been for the roar of the engines which throbbed on as the pulse continues to beat, in unconsciousness, I might have supposed Alabama City to be a village whence all life had suddenly fled.

I pass over a description here and get down to her questioning of the children and her description of the children. She went to one of the mills and first encountered a little girl, a little girl that had worked *twelve hours a day* and was *too tired to stand*. Mrs. Van Vorst says:

She sank down beside me, leaning back against the post of the door-steps. Her face was hardly less white than the knitted woolen "cloud" which covered her head.

"I am tired enough to sit down," she sighed.

"Do you get tired in the mill?" I asked.

"I reckon I do. We live up on the hill yonder, and when I first started to work it didn't seem nights like I ever could get home. Now I don't mind it."

"How long have you been at work?"

"Over a year."

"And how old are you?"

"Eleven."

"What are the hours in the mill?"

"About twelve a day, I reckon."

"Twelve?"

Listen to this description. She tells how she arrived at her estimate of twelve hours a day:

"Well, there's the first bell at half-past 4—"

That is in the morning, Mr. President—half-past 4 in the morning—

"that's for ringin' us up; then there's the second bell for breakfast; and they don't give us more than a few minutes to eat before they begin callin' us at 20 minutes to 6."

A girl of 11 years, and I will show instances of girls of 5, 6, and 7 that are gotten out of bed at half-past 4 in the morning and are standing on their feet at 6, working for twelve hours a day, until the sun goes down.

"And you get out at—"

"Twenty minutes a-past 6."

A girl awakened at half-past 4 a. m.; in the mill at 6; working all day until half-past 6 p. m. That is the kind of a person out of which we are going to make the "capitalists" of the future, according to the editorial that I read when I began my remarks.

With only half an hour for lunch?

She leaned listlessly against the wooden post.

Here is another example. I choose to give these specific illustrations so that we will not be indulging in any suppositious cases. Here is another girl:

She was the victim, and there are many, not only of greed, but of the ignorance of parents. Her father and brothers made enough to support the family and to put money aside, for the house in which they lived they had built themselves, and they owned it and the ground on which it stood.

Then Mrs. Van Vorst, to be absolutely truthful, gives a statement about the generosity of the mill owners themselves.

The founders of the mills at Alabama City have made the village as attractive as possible (given the monotony which any place must present where everybody has about the same income, and that income very small). The little one-story houses occupied by the mill families are built with sloping, irregular roofs, verandas which are more or less screened by vines the company has planted. About each home there is a small bit of ground inclosed with a fence, all of which, together with the fact that no two of the cottages are just alike, gives a pleasing aspect to the town. No law obliges such corporations to provide a schoolhouse and teacher or a library, and one's first impulse is to feel that here, really, is a mill run almost on philanthropic principles. Alabama City is undoubtedly the most attractive mill town in the South, but the difficulty of procuring operatives and of keeping them is so great that it is a good investment to make the surroundings as alluring as possible, and it is cheaper to offer swimming pools and amusement halls and lodge rooms than it is to raise the wages of 2,000 laborers.

When the half past 12 bell rang, the diverse avenues of the little town began to fill with the slow, languid procession dragging along toward the open mill gates.

Then she joined the operatives. Then she says:

Three things struck me most forcibly: The ghastly appearance of all the hands; the extreme animation and cheerfulness of the little children; the appalling languor of the girls and boys who were fifteen and over.

Here, as well as when I begin to examine the reasons for the deterioration of the British people, I might as well point out that when the children begin work, say, at 7 or 8, they are extremely animated. The vitality which ought to go for growth, which ought to go for development, goes into the work they are doing, and it is with neurotic activity that they toil. But so exhausted do they become by that kind of labor in that kind of an atmosphere that one of the consequences is that by the time they have reached 15 and 16 they are practically nervous wrecks.

The girl who volunteered to "show me around" was typical; she had the natural awkwardness of those whose muscles have deteriorated because of poor nourishment. She hitched along, wielding her arms and hands, like so much dead weight, as best she could. Her face was pale to transparency. How old was she? "Most 16." And how long had she been at work? "About eight years."

Down in the "weave room" my guide was a girl of 14, whose apprenticeship at "spinnin'" had lasted five years.

The first girl began work at 8 years of age and the last girl at 9 years of age.

There's just piles of little ones in here—too little, I think.

That is what the girls were saying to Mrs. Van Vorst.

When the owner used to come through we used to "run out," those tiniest ones.

"Run out?" I asked.

"Yes; hide 'em in the closets or anywhere for fear he'd stop 'em workin'."

There are humane men among these mill owners.

## A FUTURE "CAPITALIST."

Here is a description of one of the future "capitalists," which the New York Sun seems to think will develop from these children. This is the best description of the best child that Mrs. Von Vorst specifically describes:

His legs and arms protruded, bare and lank, from clothes long since outgrown, and his whole attitude expressed such physical exhaustion that instinctively I exclaimed to the woman who waited at the door-step:

"Is that your boy?"

Perhaps she detected something more than curiosity in my tone, for she answered:

"Yes, mam. He's been sleepin'. He's on fer *night work* neow."

This boy was 15 years of age, and had begun to work at 7. He could not read or write and insisted that next year he was going to school. He was helping to support his mother. He was a fine type of boy.

He had never had a book in his hands or "scratched a line," as his mother put it; he had had no contact with that outside world of imagination and learning in which the rest of us dwell. He had been for years up before dawn and plied in the *service of a machine for twelve hours a day*; he had spent his childhood as a laborer, a bread winner, who earned food and shelter not only for himself, but for another; he had lived without pleasure, without amusements, without hope—without hope, yes; but never without courage.

And when at last an opportunity presented itself, what form did it take? The chance to extenuate his remaining energies working night and day; to be drenched to the skin; to be too tired to eat when food was put before him, too exhausted to sleep when his head touched the pillow. This was his chance, and he met it fighting the good fight and bound to be victor. His lank and withered body gave evidence sufficient of what he was going through.

In Georgia, I think it was—the Senators from that State can tell me if it was not—there was a "gentleman's agreement" among mill owners in lieu of the law such as they have now. I will have something to say about that law later on.

Mr. BACON. What is the Senator's remark?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. A "gentleman's agreement" among manufacturers it was called.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator mean to inquire whether or not there is a law in the State on that subject?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not inquire. I know.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand the Senator's remark.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What I am explaining, or was just about to explain, is that there was in Georgia among the cotton manufacturers a "gentleman's agreement" about the working of children.

Mr. BACON. There was.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That took the place of the law. You have a law down there at present which, for the purpose of stopping child labor, is not worth the paper it is printed on, as the Senator himself ought to know, and if he does not I shall convince him of it by testimony which can be established in court.

Mr. BACON. Of course, that is a very pointed remark, and if the Senator will permit me to say a word—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I have no design to interrupt the Senator in his presentation—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is all right.

Mr. BACON. But as he has, in the first place, appealed to me, and then, in the second place, proceeds to express his opinion with such definite precision and absolute conclusiveness and to lay upon me the responsibility of a possible want of sincerity—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, no; I did not say that.

Mr. BACON. I simply wish to say to the Senator, for I disagree with him with very great hesitation and much diffidence and great regret in view of the predetermined judgment he has pronounced upon the matter—

## THE GEORGIA LAW.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to say that I disclaim any intention of reflecting on the Senator's sincerity, and I do not know how in the world he ever could infer it from what I said. I simply said that I am familiar with the Georgia law; I am familiar with the so-called "gentlemen's agreement" that preceded it; I am familiar with the fact that the law does not amount to anything in Georgia, and I was quite sure that the Senator—acute, able, public man as he is, and I say that with all possible earnestness—knew those things. In fact, I do not think the Senator will stand up and deliver any eulogy on the law of Georgia, or if he does, he certainly will not deliver any eulogy upon what happens under it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I would not undertake to follow the Senator in his criticism at this time especially, but in order that I may not be misunderstood I will simply say to the Senator that the need for a law had been generally recognized in my State. One has been passed that is working well at the present time, and it is worth a little more than the paper it is

written upon, and the question which is, I think, in the minds of Senators here is not as to whether there has been and is a great evil in regard to this matter, but really whether this is a matter for the attention of the States or a matter to be dealt with, as the Senator proposes, by Federal legislation.

I do not disagree with the Senator in any manner or in any degree as to the importance of legislation of this kind and as to the importance of the correction of the evil which he is so eloquently setting forth and portraying. I am waiting with much patience when the Senator shall reach what I regard as the crucial question here, which is one of law, and when we have the argument in no ambiguous terms of the Senator there will be, he has promised us, no doubt left in the minds of any Senator as to the correctness of his position.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will do that, Mr. President; and I would not take so much time, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, with the statement of facts and the presentation of evidence in the case if I did not mean that it shall be understood that no man can say that this evil is exaggerated; that we indulge in vague charges without coming down to specifications of the actual evil and the infamous inhumanity of it and the danger of it to our institutions. That is why I am taking so much time, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, with the facts.

So far as his State is concerned, I say to the Senator, and I think that he will agree with me, if it was in my State I should attack it with tenfold more vigor than I do the evil in another State.

I do not think that in its broader aspects this is a State question at all. I do not intend now to get into the legal part of this argument; but I will say this—that I have so drawn this bill as to eliminate the question of "State rights," because I myself profoundly respect those who sincerely hold to that political doctrine. I have so drawn the bill that every "States rights" man can vote for it without violating his constitutional convictions. If I had not meant to do that, I should have drawn the bill on precisely the lines of the meat bill; but I did not want to meet the question of "States rights," because I knew there are men here who sincerely believe in that political philosophy, and have been in the past, who would be again, willing to risk their lives in its support.

I do not intend to get into any debate upon that, but I think that the broader aspect of this evil is purely national. It is not only State citizens that you are ruining, it is the citizens of the Republic as well. It is not only Georgia children that are being murdered, it is American children as well. It is not confined to Pennsylvania alone. It exists all over the Republic. I shall show by an affidavit that in the Northern States, in which the best factory inspection in the United States exists, Illinois, the law is violated. It is something which in its broader aspect the States, as I shall show when I come to argue that part of it, can not reach.

But what I am doing now is presenting facts. I know it is monotonous, I know it is wearisome; but it is like trying a case in court. The evidence must be presented. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his patience.

Mrs. Van Vorst continues:

The "gentlemen's agreement" made in Georgia among employers affects only the cotton industry. In all other manufactures no laws, written or unwritten, exist to protect the laborer.

This is July 7, 1906:

## WORK IN A BAG MILL.

At a bag company works in Atlanta there are in the spinning room the usual 100 "kids" out of a total of 160 hands. The sweepers and doffers whom I questioned gave their ages as 7, 9, and one little wail responded apologetically: "I am 5—I am only he'pin'."

The overseer himself volunteered this conclusive testimony: "There's children in here, lots of 'em that I'm morally satisfied are under 12 years old; but when the parents swear, what can you do about it?"

Of course under this bill if he found himself before a United States court, with a penitentiary staring him in his face, he would know "what to do about it." He would err on the right side. That is what he "would do about it," and not accept the false and perjured certificate of unworthy parents, when he morally knew that the child whose life he was crushing out was under-age. I have no respect for the man whose conscience can be relieved by a perjured certificate as to the age of a child.

Hear Mrs. Van Vorst further:

Bad as are the conditions in this company's spinning rooms, it is nevertheless not here, but in the bag mill, where there is nothing to restrain employers, where the worst conditions prevail.

The foreman, a kindly man, remarked as he accompanied me to this section of the factory:

"The dust here keeps me with a cold in my head about the whole time."

Fine, pernicious, it rose, this dust, in snowy clouds, filling the air. As I looked into the workshop it seemed as though a veil had been drawn before my eyes.



There were 130 hands in the room—70 of them were little children, the rest were women. Here and there were perceptible in the ghastly artificial light the wooden frames upon which the bags must be stretched and turned. They lifted their prongs high above the heads of the tallest child laborer. Yet with an upward gesture that carried him almost off his feet he must fling one bag after another over this instrument, turn them, and slip them free again with frantic speed.

The women, meanwhile provided with electric sewing machines, whose insistent "burring" produced a peculiar bedlam, were "running up" the seams on these same long and narrow bags which we are accustomed to see used for flour, meal, and the various grocers' provisions. The materials they are made of is stiffened with a dressing of white clay, which, at the first touch, is scattered from the coarse meshes of the loose-woven cotton cloth, and begins to fly about in the air, forming a cloud, settling over everything, filling gradually the lungs that inhale it at every breath.

We are often told how necessary fresh air is for those who exercise, and who, consequently, with an accelerated circulation, need more rapidly to purify their own blood. What it is difficult to imagine, must be the physical condition of the children at these mills! In such an atmosphere as we have above described, one boy turns in a day from 3,000 to 6,000 bags.

Everything, as well as the law, seems to further this voluntary destruction of lives. The public schools in the neighborhood of the mill close at 2 o'clock, so that the youngest children can go into the factory for a half day's work. And the company offers an extra 25 cents in a week's wages for the boys who, ambitious beyond their force, succeed in daily repeating thousands of times the gesture which twists their bodies out of shape.

There is, in the neighborhood of the mill, a Methodist social settlement directed by four residents who are doing admirable work among the mill hands.

I want to stop right here and say to any Senator who doubts this sworn evidence, that I have very large photographs showing the children in these establishments, and you can see what kind of children are working twelve hours a day in such conditions as these. The camera tells no lies.

Here is one illustration:

Out of forty boys who attend one of their gymnasium classes, there are just two boys who have reached the age of 12.

Here is another case:

In this mill there were children at work spinning, rolling yarn onto shuttles, preparing it for the dye room; but as I was accompanied by a clerk from the office I had no chance to question these toilers.

Then she went to another mill.

It was approaching the noon hour, and as I left the mills, walking along in the direction of the village, which lay across the canal, I came upon a small boy whose clothes, flecked with cotton, betrayed him as one of the child-labor brigade.

"Do you work at the mill?" I asked him.

"I quit," he affirmed.

"Why?" I queried again.

"They made me work till 12 o'clock."

"Till 12 at night?"

"Yes, mam; an' I had to come home alone, so I thought I might as well quit."

A little farther along there was a group of boys varying in age between 3 and 10 years—

This is in Georgia—

The oldest a mere wraith. His face was pale to ghastliness, and his hair had grown long and sparse with a vitality that contradicted the lifelessness of his flesh and skin.

I put the usual question, and he answered:

"I did work to the mill. But I took chills, an' so I quit."

There is no question about those children's age.

Here is another description of child labor in a mill.

Mr. BACON. At what point in Georgia was that?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the cotton works in Atlanta, I think.

Mr. BACON. In Atlanta?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I think all these mills are at Atlanta, though this whole series of articles deals with the condition in various States, and it is generally known where they are located. I suppose the affidavits must be now on the way.

Toll-worn and haggard, silent, dogged, they resembled in no way the little folks who are yet on the side of life which is all expectancy and hope.

She could get the names of the "truants" in the schools, and having thus obtained the names of the "truants," she would visit the homes where the children were "truants," because they were in the mills until they got home.

The oldest of the trio who returned to this miserable home of which he was the mainstay was 14; he had been nine years at work, and during that existence among the whirling bobbins of the spinning room, something of the machine's monotony had reflected itself irreparably in his jaded eyes.

Of course he will be one of future captains of industry of whom the Sun editorial prophesies.

He was dressed with a self-respecting neatness; his hair was brushed back against his gray, wrinkled forehead—it seemed, indeed, observing his ghastly pallor, as though he were, by his own hands, made ready for the grave, waiting only the final blow which would carry him hence.

The other two hands were a girl of 8, who kept still some of the buoyancy of childhood, and a boy of 11, who looked like so much formless clay which had been carried as debris from the potter's wheel.

Silently this little trio filed into the kitchen; there was not half an hour to spend at home, to dine, and to return again to the greedy mill.

You might think, you who have watched your own rosy cheeked children devour with normal appetites the hot and savory food set be-

fore them at noon, that these little laborers, who already had accomplished a six hours of work, would have fallen ravenously upon their dinner. Without speaking these three children took their places at the table, and, as though with an effort, they swallowed this meal.

They did not touch the bacon—their throats, dry and parched from the overheated atmosphere of the spinning room, refused the nourishing food and craved some stimulant, like the clear black coffee, of which they greedily partook.

She describes that too much in detail for me to take time to read it. After the description, she goes on:

"There's everyday school," she went on, "and there's night school three times a week, where I try to send the children, but it seems like they wuz too tired when night comes."

How much did they make—these three breadwinners?

Fifty to sixty cents a day.

When the children had slowly and with difficulty swallowed the tasteless dinner, they set out again, silent and dogged, for the mills. And no exception were they. From the rows of frame houses along the canal there came other children making their way, silent, dogged, toward the great brick fabric which produced manufactures to the value of \$10,000,000 yearly.

Mr. BACON. The last instance the Senator read was in Atlanta, was it?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I suppose those are the mills. I suppose she means those mills.

Mr. BACON. But I am speaking about the particular instance which the Senator is now reading.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I take it, it is Atlanta.

Mr. BACON. I think not, from the fact that there is no canal there. That is the reason I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At any rate, it is some mill town; but that is not important.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon the interruption at this point—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be glad to have the Senator's interruption.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say that while I have no doubt that there have been great evils in this regard in Georgia, while I have no doubt that there have been instances such as the Senator has read, and while I have no doubt, in a general way, that there has been a great deal of evil from child labor in the factories in Georgia, as there has been everywhere where there has been factory work, if not in Indiana—and I presume it is true to a greater or less degree there, although the Senator's remarks as to what condition exists in Indiana would indicate that, in his opinion, such a condition does not exist there—I want to simply say that, while there may be these instances, as doubtless there have been, and while I would not minimize the fact that the general matter of child labor in the State has been one which has constituted an evil, still it is a very great injustice to present these isolated instances as representative of general conditions. For myself I have been in a position where I have seen a great deal of the factory population, although I never owned a dollar's worth of stock in a factory in my life. I know that the instances which have been recounted here are not representative of the general conditions.

I simply want to make that general statement in justice to an industry in my State, which is a very large one, and very largely under the control and management of men whom I know personally to be men of high character. While these evils have existed to an extent possibly which should not have been permitted under their supervision and management, possibly in isolated instances such as have escaped their immediate attention, in the large manufacturing centers of Atlanta and Augusta and Macon and Columbus, where these cotton manufactories are, and other towns, dozens of which I could mention, the factory population generally are in a comfortable situation. They live in well-built and well-ventilated houses, not crowded, and the conditions are not such as have been portrayed by these magazine writers, whose articles I have sometimes read, about the factories in my own immediate neighborhood, where I have known the facts. They have taken isolated cases and have endeavored to make it appear that they represent general conditions.

If I do not trespass upon the Senator too long, I wish to add, as he has brought up the State of Georgia pointedly—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not more pointedly, I will say to the Senator, than I have brought up Pennsylvania or Maine, or than I intend to bring up North Carolina and South Carolina; not more pointedly than I did Alabama, and not more pointedly than I will New Jersey or any other State where such conditions exist.

Mr. BACON. I quite understand that the Senator desired to make no particular allusion to my State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; but just to refer to the States where the conditions exist.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me a moment—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. What I wanted to say is that the Senator has pointedly alluded to the Georgia law, which was intended to correct these evils, and he has spoken of that law as not being worth the paper on which it is written. I wish to ask the Senator, in this connection, in order that it may go out to the country with the learned speech of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, to permit me to insert in the RECORD in his remarks the law of the State of Georgia in regard to child labor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not want it published in the RECORD in the midst of my speech, for I am myself going to give an abstract of your law.

Mr. BACON. An abstract is not the law.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And I am going to show by prominent newspapers of the Senator's town, and I will put in the sworn statements before I get through, as to the applications under this new law. I will talk about the law a little later, when we come to discuss its utter inefficiency under existing conditions.

As to these being "isolated" instances which do not do justice, etc., if that is the point the Senator wants to make, I am glad he wants to make it and to have him make any other point he wants to make.

Mr. BACON. The Senator's speech will doubtless have a wider circulation than that of any other Senator would have, and as he is more familiar with this subject, having made a study of this question and having denounced this law, of which he proposes to give only an abstract—it is not a very long enactment—I should like very much, in justice to the lawmaking power of my State, to have the law published, in order that the public may judge, not according to the Senator's opinion, but according to their own opinion, when they read the law, whether or not it is an effective and just law.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator can put the law in his own speech. I shall put an abstract of the law in my speech.

Mr. BACON. But this will not go in the RECORD as my speech at all, but will go in as the Senator's speech.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Ten RECORDS could not contain all the child-labor laws of the various States.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator declines to yield, I shall not attempt to interrupt him any further.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator must excuse me.

#### THESE NOT ISOLATED CASES.

The Senator says—and I want his attention—that these are "isolated" cases. On the contrary, they are *typical* cases. The Senator will have an opportunity to disprove them if they are not true. Everyone who has made these statements has made, or will make, an affidavit as to their truth.

When the Senator says that these are exceptional cases, what does he say about the estimate that there are to-day some 60,000 children 14 years of age or under that work in the cotton mills of the South? That is the fact, and the census figures themselves six years ago, when the industry was only in its infancy, showed there were some 30,000 children under 16 years of age working in the factories in the South. Does the Senator think that 30,000, does he think that 60,000 child slaves are "isolated" or "occasional"? It looks to me as though they are usual.

Before I get through I will take up other States. I will do so because the Senator seems to think we are not dealing with a great national evil, with a great sociological and humanitarian question.

Senators seem to think that they are the attorneys of the States here, and that when something is mentioned in which their States are named they must get up and denounce and deny it.

I am sorry I have to mention the fact that this occurs in the State of Pennsylvania or New Jersey or Maine or Georgia or any other State. It is the evil I am after, and it is the evil that the American people are going to stop.

When the Senator says these instances are "isolated" and "exceptional" and do injustice to these "best people," I will read to the Senator a little bit later on, when I come to an examination of the system of law in one of the Southern States, what some of the manufacturers said before the House Committee about their being the "best people" in another State, and I will bring affidavits from that very State to show that those children are being practically murdered there.

I want to show the fact that just a year or two ago, under one of the best laws in the United States—and when I come to discuss the laws of the States dealing with this evil I shall present affidavits showing that the mill owners of Georgia, of Alabama, and of some of the rest of the Southern States were taking train loads of shipments of children from Tennessee, where the law was properly executed and where they were prevented from perpetrating further outrages upon them.

The Senator is mistaken. He has not studied this question as I have. He has not informed himself upon it as I have and as hundreds of other very devoted people have. And let me say to the Senator people almost as eminent as the Senator himself, and as earnestly for "State rights" as the Senator, who have come, after years of effort for this reform, to the profound conviction that they must appeal to the Nation.

I give as an example of that kind of man Dr. Felix Adler, of New York, and perhaps there is not a more eminent or learned publicist and scholar living than Dr. Felix Adler. Unquestionably he is the most accomplished and learned "States-rights" man in this country. He believes in it as a principle of government, and yet, after having spent years in the study of this question, seeing it was national in character, he believes the evil can only be reached by a law that is national in its application. I repeat, the Senator is mistaken if he thinks it is "occasional" and "isolated." Are 60,000 "occasional" and "isolated?"

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I want to ask the Senator a question for information. He said there are 60,000 children in the cotton mills of the South. I want to know what proportion that bears to the total number of employees?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There have been various statements made as to the fact, and I shall produce, before I get through the evidence in this case, a clipping from a paper in North Carolina, which gives the statement, I think, of the president of the Cotton Association, to the effect that 75 per cent of the operatives were children.

Mr. CARMACK. Under 14 years of age?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I yield.

Mr. BACON. I will not interrupt the Senator any further.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is all right; go on.

Mr. BACON. The Senator in reply to the suggestion as to the efficacy of the Georgia law made a statement as to the number of children under age in the South who are now employed in the mills. I should like to ask the Senator, as he seems to have exhaustively studied the question, if he is prepared to state how many children in Georgia under 12 years of age or under 14 years of age are to-day employed in the mills?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will answer the Senator even more directly than that. I will state that under the new law, which went into effect this very year, there had been applications for the employment of children up to last week in the county clerk's office—I believe it is in Atlanta, or whichever is the greatest city in your State—for 3,000 children, just as there were in Maryland applications since the new law went into effect there for 11,000 children, 1,200 of which were affected, although the census shows there were only 5,000 children of that age at work after the law went into effect on the first of the year; and I shall present it. There have been applications for more than 3,000.

Mr. BACON. How many of the applications have been granted?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All were granted.

Mr. BACON. Has the Senator any evidence that they were all granted?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir. There is no factory inspection in your State. I will further say to the Senator that any of the cotton manufacturers down there with whom the Senator is on friendly terms will tell him that the law is not worth, so far as standing in the way of the employment of children is concerned, the paper on which it is written. I have had the statement made to me that it was just precisely the kind of law they wanted. If the Senator wants to defend some portion of his case—I believe he is on the subcommittee which is to pass upon the question as to whether or not we can do anything with this bill—I advise him not to take that phase of it.

I will come to the exact statement about those 3,000. I do not want to disarrange my papers or I would try to fish it up now. At present I will continue the testimony:

#### ANOTHER MILL.

Passing apparently unnoticed through the spinning rooms I questioned the children at will. Thirty of those to whom I spoke gave their ages as under 12.

That is "occasional" and "isolated"—thirty in one mill.

There were none younger than 9, but many of those 11 and 12 had been five years at work. They worked with a mechanical activity, with nervous energy and determination, and though I saw not one face that had in it a ray of hope, yet I heard never a murmur of complaint nor an exclamation of impatience or revolt.



Over and over again, as I talked with the children, I tried to join the broken threads of the spools onto the whirling bobbins. Missing the "roller" nine times out of ten, and letting thus the "sliver" accumulate in soft, vaporous clouds, I caused some amusement among my youthful instructors.

As far as light and air and new machinery were concerned, the conditions in the mill seemed to be irreproachable. However, though light and air may, in a nursery, prove adequate requisites, in a factory which works its employees mercilessly they contribute only to prolonging for a brief space "the slow death" of the child hands.

Here is another—

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I hate to interrupt the Senator, but then the Senator's statements, as I say, go out to the world, and the condition that he speaks of as being one that renders absolutely worthless the Georgia law, under which a large number of applications have been made, I want to just read one single sentence from the Georgia law—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Go ahead; read it.

Mr. BACON. Showing that the condition to which he refers must terminate on the 1st day of January, 1908.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; it is since the 1st day of January that applications have been made.

Mr. BACON. Exactly. Section 3 of the Georgia statute is as follows:

*Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That on and after January 1, 1908, no child under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.*

So that so far as night work is concerned, it is absolutely excluded and prohibited.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What the Senator reads is a good deal as though we should pass this kind of a law: "*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, That men shall be good.*"

You have no factory inspection; you have no way of enforcing your law; you have no way of properly determining the ages of children, and your law is not enforced.

Mr. BACON. It is made a penal offense to violate its provisions. It can be enforced that way.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly, it is made a penal offense; but who is to inform and who is to find out? Has there been any prosecution thus far? No; there has been no prosecution thus far, and it is getting along in the year, too.

"DON'T KNOW HOW TO PLAY."

Here is another:

There was in this busy mill an unusual freedom, a surprising indifference to the intrusion of an outsider upon its precincts. I took advantage of it, and lingered to talk with a girl who had followed me out of the spinning room onto the stairs. Her eyes reflected the misery and insufficiency to which she had too soon been accustomed.

"Have you been long at work?" I asked her.

"Yes, four years. I'm 15 now. I come in when I wuz eleavun."

I am going to pass rapidly through this because I want to get to the legal part of the argument, but I must read this to the Senator. Let us see where it is from? In one of the Southern mill towns—

Up in a back yard in Avenue B I found a group of children who belonged in the factory rightly, but who were not at work for the same reasons that big hands are "not at work;" some were ill, some were discontented. They made a pitiful group. Ghastly was their pallor in the broad daylight, and pathetic their childish efforts to amuse themselves. This bruised and limping detachment of the child-labor battalion:

"What are you playing?" I asked.

A tall boy of 10 or 12, with an uncertain hip which seemed to give under him at every step, answered sheepishly:

"We don't know how to play."

There, Mr. President, are two evidences that investigators found children that did not know how to play and did not know what they were playing.

"Why aren't you at work?" This was a more suggestive question. "I got struck in the cardin' room." He touched his hip. "I am only taking a day off."

That boy was 11 years of age. Here was another case:

The first joint of his thumb was gone—

And I want to say to the Senator from Georgia and to all Senators and to the whole country that I can produce evidence, if necessary, that it is not uncommon among the mill children of the South for them to be without one and two fingers, and sometimes two fingers and a thumb, and that, too, before they are 10 years old.

"How did you lose that?" I queried—

Meaning his thumb—

"Cardin'," he answered in his mild, aged manner. "I have been over a year't the mill."

"How old are you?"

"Ten."

So he lost his thumb at 9.

"Are there any boys as young as you are in the mill?"

"Heaps of 'em younger," he affirmed; and then, lest I get an exaggerated impression, he corrected:

"There's none younger'n 8 years old."

"Do you like to work?" I went on.

There was a lassitude about his whole tiny person, yet his response was nevertheless resolute.

"I like work better'n doin' nothin'."

"Wouldn't you like to go to school?"

"I never have been to school," he said, "but I'd love that better'n anything."

I should like the attention of the Senator from Georgia to this. This is from the article of Mrs. Van Vorst:

Determined, as was my declared intention from the beginning, to relate only what I myself saw and heard, I have in writing these accounts kept to the truth in every detail. Yet I doubt whether these simple descriptions have conveyed vividly enough the impression of misery, of hopelessness, of weariness, and depletion given by the children who toll, to one who considers them from the human point of view, and not merely as the inconveniences of a "necessary evil."

#### WHAT MILL SUPERINTENDENT SAID.

So far the intervention of the "police" throughout Georgia and Alabama has been but nominal. In such mill villages as Pell City, Lindale, Alabama City, and West Huntsville, where the "corporation" owns the land, the buildings on it, the schools, the church, there the corporation practically makes the only laws applied, and applies them according to its fancy. The nature of this corporation is in no wise different from that of the feudal baron, and were it not for the love of freedom, which, because they are Americans, actuates even the most forlorn specimens of the cotton mill and causes them, in frequent outbursts of revolt, to be ever on the move, changing one slave master for another—were it not for this spirit of independence shown on the part of the laborers, the abuses perpetrated in the "corporation" villages would resemble nothing so much as the oppression of the people by the grand seigneurs of the Middle Ages; that same oppression which, weighing too long time and too heavily, brought about at last a vengeance so bloodthirsty and so appalling that the slothful patrons, quaking in prison, dubbed it the "Reign of Terror," and history gave it the more dignified appellation of "the great revolution."

Nothing could be clearer than the statement regarding child labor made to me by one of the mill agents in Alabama:

"If the parents swear falsely about the ages of their children, what are we to do? We are here, first of all, to make money."

And a more humane superintendent, who had been for years in the mills near Huntsville, put the case in this way:

"No one would want to have children, but you can't get the big help, and if you won't take the children the parents won't stay; and when they swear, what are you going to do? There should be compulsory school education. The law now is a dead letter."

That, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, is a statement of a mill owner himself, and the same statement has personally been made to me by a mill owner of Georgia concerning the recent law that was passed there.

#### THE EVIL NATIONAL.

Mrs. Van Vorst continues:

The question of child labor is not confined to any one section of the country; it is national; and in the South it is native, one may say, owing to the absence as yet of all foreign element in the laboring population.

It is native—that is, it is American—children that are being ruined in the South. Let the Senator from Georgia think of that.

Now I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read an affidavit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Personally appeared before me this 22d day of January, 1907, Elbert Hubbard, to me known, and made affidavit as follows: I reside at East Aurora, N. Y., and am president and manager of the Roycrofters Corporation, said corporation employing about 500 workers. I have been a day laborer, a factory foreman, and for ten years was superintendent of the Larkin Soap Company, of Buffalo, N. Y. I am familiar with labor conditions in many States and countries. My article on child labor, which was printed in The Philistine Magazine for May, 1902, was written after personally visiting various cotton mills in six different States, and the facts therein stated are substantially true and correct, and still exist.

ELBERT HUBBARD.

Sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] CHAS. S. WRIGHT,

Notary Public for and in Erie County, N. Y.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is dated last week. He says he has become familiar with labor conditions, and he wrote from personal investigation the article which I am going to read. Note that Mr. Hubbard says that what I shall now read is true to-day.

Mr. KEAN. It was written in 1902.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In 1902, but there has been no change in the law down in South Carolina about which this article was written. Hubbard says it is all true now. I have not personally investigated, but men and women who have made oath to those statements. If the Senator thinks this evil is not greater than it was when this article was written I shall prove

by a large number of affidavits, which I am going to have read in a moment, that it is worse.

I want to read here—and while I am taking a great deal of time to present the evidence in this case, I can tell Senators that it is only the beginning of the evidence that is at my disposal, and that, if this debate proceeds much longer and if it is required, much more evidence and many more statements, *all susceptible of proof in court*, will be produced whenever it is desired.

#### CHILD LABOR IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

Says Mr. Hubbard, under oath, mind you:

The infant factory slaves of South Carolina can never develop into men and women. There are no mortality statistics; the mill owners baffle all attempts of the outside public to get at the facts, but my opinion is that in many mills death sets the little prisoner free inside of four years.

Beyond that he can not hope to live, and this opinion is derived from careful observation and interviews with several skilled and experienced physicians who practice in the vicinity of the mills.

Boys and girls from the age of 6 years and upwards are employed. They usually work from 6 o'clock in the morning until 7 at night. For four months of the year they go to work before daylight and they work until after dark.

At noon I saw them squat on the floor and devour their food, which consisted mostly of corn bread and bacon. These weakened pigmies munched in silence and then *tumbled over in sleep* on the floor in all the abandon of babyhood. Very few wore shoes and stockings; dozens of little girls of, say, 7 years of age wore only one garment, a linsey-woolsey dress. When it came time to go to work the foreman marched through the groups, shaking the sleepers, shouting in their ears, lifting them to their feet, and in a few instances *kicking* the delinquents into wakefulness.

The long afternoon had begun—from a quarter to 1 until 7 o'clock they worked without respite or rest.

These toddlers I saw, for the most part, did but one thing—they watched the flying spindles on a frame 20 feet long and tied the broken threads.

That reminds me of what I read to the Senate—but not many Senators heard it, for somehow they do not seem to care to listen to this evidence—concerning the silk girl of the Pennsylvania mill, who watched the thread and its play until at night she could not sleep for seeing the threads that seemed to burn into her eyeballs.

Of course it is not so interesting, I suppose, to learn about the murder of these children as it is to hear an academic discussion about artificial "rights" of artificial things, or a "constitutional" discussion on the law. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I will come to that in due season, but not until the facts have been laid before the country. So, again to the evidence. Mr. Hubbard goes on:

They could not sit at their tasks. Back and forward they paced, watching with inanimate, dull look the flying spindles. The roar of the machinery drowned every other sound—back and forth paced the baby toilers in their bare feet and mended the broken threads. Two, three, or four threads would break before they could control the 20 feet—the threads were always breaking.

The noise and the constant looking at the flying wheels reduce nervous sensation in a few months to the minimum. The child does not think; he ceases to suffer.

He does his work like an automaton; he is a part of the roaring machinery; memory is seared; physical vitality is at such low ebb that he ceases to suffer. Nature puts a short limit on torture by sending insensibility. If you suffer it is a sure sign you are alive.

At a certain night school where several good women were putting forth efforts to mitigate the condition of these baby slaves, one of the teachers told me that they did not try to teach the children to read; they simply put forth an effort to arouse the spirit through pictures and telling stories. In this school I saw the sad spectacle of *half the class*—of a dozen or more—*sunk into sleep* that more resembled a stupor. The teacher was a fine, competent woman, but worn-out nature was too much for her. To teach you must make your appeal to life.

The reason that thought flags and stupor takes possession of the child who works at one task for *eleven hours a day* is through the fact that he does not express himself. We grow through expression, and expression, which is exercise, is necessary to life. The child in the mill never talks to anyone—even if the rules did not forbid it, the roar of the machinery would make it impossible. All orders are carried out in pantomime, emphasized by pokes, punches, pinches, shakes, and kicks. This wee slave loses all relationship with his fellows and the world about him.

Then he describes some of the other children he met, and here is an instance he gives. I want to say to the Senator from Georgia, about this evil being sporadic, that if I had given a large number of figures it would have been said there is no inhumanity in that. It is a good thing for children to work, we hear. "I worked," one Senator says, "and I have succeeded," etc.

So I have given specific instances, which I stated at the beginning of this speech were typical, because I wanted to place the finger on definite cases, at definite places, and just what a child 6 years old working twelve hours a day does, and what such labor means. That is the reason I have read these descriptions that shock the Senator and will shock the country.

Mr. Hubbard grows specific and particular. He says—and under oath, don't forget that:

I thought to lift one of the little toilers to ascertain his weight. Straightway through his 35 pounds of skin and bones there ran a tremor of fear, and he struggled forward to tie a broken thread. I attracted his attention by a touch and offered him a silver dime. He looked at me dumbly, from a face that might have belonged to a man of 60, so furrowed, tightly drawn, and full of pain it was.

That sounds precisely like the description that Durand gives, that Roberts gives, that Spargo gives, and that Mrs. Kelley gives, that Mrs. Van Vorst gives, that Miss Ashley gives. Can it be that all these men and women, as high grade as any in this country, have made a mistake, have told an untruth, and then *made affidavit to it?*

They say these are *typical* and not occasional. But of course all these people, who probably never saw one another, and who investigated independently, agreed in some mysterious way, some psychical way, to tell the *same lie*, and then, acting separately, have the audacity to swear to that lie. So Mr. Hubbard goes on:

He did not reach for the money. He did not know what it was. I tried to stroke his head and caress his cheek. My smile of friendship meant nothing to him. He shrank from my touch as though he expected punishment. A caress was unknown to this child, sympathy had never been his portion, and the love of a mother, who only a short time before held him in her arms, had all been forgotten in the whirl of wheels and the awful silence of a din that knows no respite.

There were dozens of just such children in this particular mill.

It was not "isolated" in that instance, as the Senator from Georgia says. But, of course, all this is false—how could it be true of "our best people," who are the mill owners, according to the Senator from Georgia?

A physician who was with me said that they would all be dead probably in two years and their places filled with others. There were plenty more.

And a manufacturer in my own town voiced the spirit that animates most men who take a position like the head of this mill took. He said, "We are a prolific race. If they die there will be plenty more." But, Mr. President, think as you like, I say that is not the way we are going to conduct the American Republic from this time forward.

Mr. President, I intend to read no more upon this particular point, because I see it is already getting late.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

THE OUTRAGE A NATIONAL, NOT A SECTIONAL, ONE.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will not omit to put into the Record any well-authenticated statements from respectable and honest people that will bear upon this evil. Every thoughtful man recognizes it as a very great evil, and I will go as far as any man in trying to stamp it out in a legitimate and constitutional way. I hope the Senator will not omit, as I said a while ago, to get all well-authenticated facts into the Record, so that we may have ammunition with which to begin crusades at home to keep our legislatures from being influenced by northern millionaires who have gone down there and built mills and made industrial slaves out of white children instead of the chattel black slaves of the old days. I will join the Senator if he can show me how to do it here constitutionally.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the observation the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has just made beyond a doubt is to a certain extent correct. There is northern money in South Carolina; and God help South Carolina if there was not northern money there. [Applause in the galleries.]

I want to add one further suggestion on that point.

Elbert Hubbard has been quoted in this discussion. I think his statement was not read in full. I sometimes read the fulminations of that very versatile man, and I recall very distinctly that in one of Elbert Hubbard's articles he stated that the parents in the South demanded that the children should work in the mills, and that they were infinitely more to blame than the men who furnished the capital to run the mills.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is well for us to put that fact in the Record as well as the fact the Senator from South Carolina suggested.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In just a moment. I want to say that my study of this question, which has been somewhat careful, confirms that; but the infamy of the murder of children is not to be excused on account of the infamy of parents who are willing to see them work. There is no question about that. The mill owner, however, ought not to satisfy his conscience by what he knows to be a perjured certificate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I will allow you.



Mr. TILLMAN. I know there are fathers and mothers in South Carolina as well as there are elsewhere who to my mind occupy the relation toward their children of cannibals, who force them to get up before day and go to work, while they, especially the father, sit around and loaf and live off their children's labor. But I do not see the force of the sneer of the Senator from New Hampshire in saying God help South Carolina if there was no northern money there. I will say to that Senator that rather than have northern money go there and exercise its lobbying influences through the instrumentalities of mill presidents and directors and others who go to the legislature and maneuver and manipulate and manage to keep proper child-labor laws from being enacted, I wish that he and all others who can keep northern money away would keep it away from the State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not going to take up any more time—and it is purely a question of time—in presenting testimony. I have not produced half that I have at hand, and certainly I presented enough in my half to show to the Senate and to the country the widespread nature of this evil.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Senator not to omit anything that is well authenticated and honest. Publish it all in a document, so that we can have it to circulate among the good men and women of the South and help us to organize a crusade to stop this hellishness.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator said that before. I am going to publish it so that the American people can tell the American Congress to pass a law that will stop it now in South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and everywhere else, and I am going to ask the Senator to vote for such a law, if I can show him by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that such a law would be constitutional.

Mr. TILLMAN. I shall listen to the Senator with great interest when he comes to the constitutional argument, but until he convinces me and other Senators that the power of Congress under the interstate-commerce clause reaches to a matter like this I think he will find great difficulty in passing such a law through this body, because there are others who, like myself, believe that Congress has nothing to do with the police regulations of the States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will undertake to prove that to the Senator, unless he is in the condition of a man who "convinced against his will is of the same opinion still."

Mr. TILLMAN. I will listen.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator has expressed his opinion upon the constitutionality of this proposed law. Has the Senator read the decisions of the Supreme Court upon this question?

Mr. TILLMAN. No.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And yet you have an opinion upon it, which it will be difficult for me to change, and I have read those decisions.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I have a very strong opinion, based on general common sense—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, well.

Mr. TILLMAN. That the Constitution reserves to the States the police power, and that the matter of dealing with the health and morals of the people is a police regulation and outside the jurisdiction of Congress. If the Senator thinks he can convince me that I am wrong, I will listen to his argument.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will attempt to do that when I come to it. I am not going to produce any more of these statements. I have here marked statements as to its effect upon health, as to the effect upon the morals, as to its effect upon degeneracy, and all that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Print it as a document, if you please.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am going to print it in my speech. I am much obliged to the Senator. I ask leave, Mr. President, to have printed as a part of my speech these extracts which I intended to read. It will simply save time. I have a vast deal of other testimony which I will produce on another phase of this subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

(The matter referred to appears in subsequent parts of Mr. BEVERIDGE's remarks under appropriate headings.)

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator has spoken of conditions in various States, and he referred to the law in Tennessee as being an admirable law.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. Has the Senator any information that that law is defective in its operation?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Allow me to say to the Senator from Tennessee that we can not hear him.

Mr. CARMACK. I want to state that so far as one State is concerned no Federal legislation is needed to bring about this reform.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will show the Senator that it is, and I will now tell him why.

Mr. CARMACK. Not so far as Tennessee is concerned.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and I will show the Senator why when I come to the point, which will be in a moment, if he will let me proceed in orderly fashion with my argument. I want to call the Senator's attention to a fact, and he can think about it, so as to be able to interrupt me when I come to it. I want to say to the Senator and all Senators that I am only too delighted to give way at any time to any Senator for a question upon any point. I am as earnest about this matter, I think, as he can be, and if at any point I am wrong on a question of fact or a question of law I want to be interrupted. I want to say to the Senator, so that he can be thinking about it—

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think he is any more earnest in the discussion of child labor than the remainder of his colleagues?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I think a good deal more earnest.

Mr. SPOONER. I doubt the Senator's accuracy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think I am—a good deal more. I have been earnest enough to spend nights and days and weeks and months in accumulating testimony. I have been earnest enough to appeal to the American people all over this country during the last campaign, from as far west as Nebraska to as far east as Maine. Has the Senator done as much?

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me a suggestion?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator mistakes zeal for earnestness. That he is very zealous we undoubtedly know, but I deny that he is more earnest than I am and than all other Senators are.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator give the distinction between "zeal" and "earnestness"? Of course I can not yield to the Senator to indulge in any refinements as to the meaning of words. We both know that good and bad State laws make business inequality.

I want to say to the Senator from Tennessee what I was going to say when the Senator from Wisconsin interrupted me. The manufacturers of the Senator's own State have by the very righteousness of your State laws been put at a commercial disadvantage with the manufacturers of Georgia, Alabama, South and North Carolina, because the manufacturers of your State can not longer employ cheap labor. They can not longer make the blood of children into gold, and that can be done by every manufacturer in these other States.

That is the trouble with the whole thing. I shall submit in a moment, when I come to present that particular question, the affidavit of a man who testifies to having been on a train that was carrying a "shipment" of children from Tennessee, where they can not be worked, to the cotton mills of other Southern States, where they can be worked.

Mr. President, we have seen that the evil exists. We have seen that it is not "isolated," as the Senator from Georgia says. We have examined instances which are typical, which are not two, five, six, ten, a dozen, a hundred, but thousands. We have all this given to us by men and women who have made oath that they themselves personally investigated the facts.

#### EFFECT OF CHILD LABOR ON HEALTH.

Now, what does it mean? In the first place, Mr. President, I have read one or two statements, under oath, that it means the literal death of these children. I have here, and shall put into the Record, abundant statements that it means the physical ruin, the mental and moral ruin, of these children themselves who are now being worked.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is an able physician, and he knows, as every other physician knows, the result of nervous exhaustion on a child put to work at from 6 or 8 years of age and kept at work for twelve hours a day amid the whirl of flying machinery or the terrors of coal breakers. If they live through it, they are permanently ruined in body and mind and soul. That is a mere physical fact.

I wish here at this point in my remarks to insert statements and affidavits of physicians; also statements of other investigators from whom I have already read on other phases of this evil.

#### DOCTOR FREIBERG'S OPINION.

First, I will present the views of Dr. Albert H. Freiberg, of Cincinnati, Ohio, whose name is familiar to the profession throughout the country. I here send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read Dr. Freiberg's affidavit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CINCINNATI, January 21, 1907.

Hon. Senator ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to certify to you certain facts regarding a paper which I read before the recent meeting of the National Child Labor Committee in Cincinnati December 14, 1906. The paper was entitled "Some of the ultimate physical effects of premature toil." This paper embodies the result of my experience with children of the working classes during thirteen years of professional experience devoted particularly to the specialty of orthopedic surgery. This concerns itself with the deformities of the human body, both congenital and acquired. The statements made therein were made bona fide and are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

During the period above referred to I have occupied a number of hospital positions in this city as orthopedic surgeon. At present I am orthopedic surgeon to the Cincinnati Hospital and to the Jewish Hospital of Cincinnati. I am also professor of orthopedic surgery in the University of Cincinnati (medical department) and am also a fellow of the American Orthopedic Association.

I therefore confirm under oath the belief that the statements made in the paper before mentioned are true and also the belief that they will correspond with the experience of others equally well qualified.

ALBERT H. FREIBERG.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 21st day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

STARBUCK SMITH,

Notary Public, Hamilton County, Ohio.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now I present extracts from Doctor Freiberg's address on "Some of the ultimate physical effects of premature toil:"

It may be of interest to call attention to certain effects of a purely physical character which professional experience has for years been accustomed to look upon as the results of environment and occupation, and especially when considered with reference to the physical peculiarities of the child between the ages of 10 and 16 years. In doing this, effort will be made to avoid that which is purely technical, but also that which is in any way still a matter of supposition rather than observation, and therefore not generally accepted.

The rôle of the play hours in the development of the young child, his innate desire for physical activity and especially in the open, are well recognized by all laymen, and there are few indeed who will not acknowledge how important these are in promoting the formative processes which are at this time of life actively going on. The statement that this natural desire for movement and exercise can not be balked in the child 8 to 10 years of age, without damage to his physical progress, will meet with little protest, and for the present discussion this is of minor importance, since by far the greater number of children at work have at least passed their tenth year, and since no State, whose statutes do not ignore the question altogether, has ventured to place the limit for work below this.

When the child arrives at its twelfth year, however, it enters a period which, lasting until its seventeenth year as a rule, is characterized not only by those changes of disposition, of mind and soul, of body and appearance, embraced by the term "puberty," but a period also during which the body experiences its most rapid growth in length. As the bones grow longer, at this rapid rate, the muscles controlling these bones must grow longer with them. The muscles must, however, increase not only in length but in volume if their strength is to be proportionate to the ever-increasing demands made upon them. That this increase of volume, therefore, of strength, is dependent upon exercise, is common knowledge; that lack of use causes wasting and therefore weakening of muscle is no less so.

It is likewise well known that excessive exercise of certain muscles will result not in increase of strength but in degeneration and weakening, and that there is no surer way of inducing great fatigue than by using the same set of muscles for a long time without change, thus giving no opportunity for what is called rest, but what is really the replenishing of muscle material which has been consumed.

Let us now apply these statements in practice: To the case of a girl feeding material to a machine and sitting in one position for hours at a time, in the case of a boy handling small articles of manufacture, having, perhaps, nothing more to do than to remove them from one machine to another close by, or to perform, in the standing position, a set of movements with rapidity, but involving no test of strength whatever. Such work commonly develops quickness of eye and dexterity of fingers. It is certainly not looked upon as involving physical strain of any account.

Here lies the fallacy. Standing and sitting are looked upon as passive and involving no great muscular action. If this were true, why should we then tire so much more easily from standing than from walking, since this apparently requires much more use of the muscles? Why so much more easily from holding a weight continuously in one position than from moving it in various directions?

As a matter of fact, standing and sitting are possible only by active muscular work, and, when prolonged, have connected with them the disadvantage of permitting but little change of activity to other muscles. It can not be surprising to learn, therefore, that under these circumstances the tissues yield under unrelieved strain; that the leg and trunk muscles become excessively fatigued and thus compel the assumption, for relief, of faulty postures and attitudes which can at first be voluntarily departed from, but which finally take the place of the normal and leave the child more or less permanently deformed. Thus it is that, even before the advent of modern factory employment, certain deformities were recognized as being associated with certain occupations; the expression "baker's legs," for example, will be found in surgical treatises written many years ago.

The argument that the labor performed by the child is not hard is therefore only a specious one. Keeping a growing individual at an occupation, for ten hours daily, which involves the use of only a limited set of muscles, when he is at an age when nature prompts running and jumping, deprives him of the need for deep breathing, and therefore expansion of the chest, which these bring with them, and of the stimulus to the blood circulation which, although often harmful to the man past middle age, is of the greatest value to the developing organism.

However desirable it may be to preserve the normal form and symmetry of the human body, that it may be agreeable to look upon, there is underlying this a factor of greater import to humanity than mere personal vanity. This is the economic factor which takes into account

the future of the individual, after the period of immaturity has passed and the child has become the citizen and has assumed the responsibilities of parentage.

Whatever can be shown to now permanently impair wage-earning capacity or to interfere with the performance of family duties, or indeed to shorten the tenure of life, will be acknowledged by all to be of prime importance. I shall not refer to such conditions as general weakness or diminished chest capacity and the tendency to acquire disease in consequence thereof, but rather to certain definite deformities which I have had frequent opportunity for observing, both in process of formation and in their final results.

For the present the various occupations of toiling children may be grouped according as the work is done in standing or sitting position. In general—and there are, of course, many exceptions—boy's work requires standing and girl's work sitting. It may also be said, in the same general way, that the work which the boy does standing is an apprenticeship for work which the man also does, as a journeyman, in the standing position.

This is correspondingly true of girl's work. Standing occupations naturally involve the feet and legs in greatest strain, and more especially the feet. In consequence we see developing, during the adolescent years, that condition known as "weak and flat foot." This frequently occurs in the adult also from causes of similar nature, but only too frequently the result of conditions and weakening which must be attributed to the period of active growth. The deformity acquired in adult years, though it may be disabling and painful in high degree, but rarely assumes the severe form so frequently seen in the later period of adolescence as a sad testimony of the child's experience.

Commonly, the foot loses its strength and shape gradually; so that at this time but little notice is taken of it. Later, when the child has become the father and the necessity for continuous employment is apparent, the feet only too frequently become so painful that long abstention from work is imperative, and it happens not rarely that an entire change of employment can not be avoided. Thus are lost the skill and aptitude acquired during the period of prematurity, for while medical science can do much for these unfortunates, they are often debarred from continuing in trades requiring constant standing.

Frequently upon coming under medical care the condition is such that nothing short of a long stay in hospital will prove availing, and this means loss of income if not loss of independence for a greater or less period. I doubt whether it is generally realized how frequently such conditions are met as those to which I have just referred. While originally uttered in a somewhat different sense, the saying seems here most appropriate that "the boy without play is the father without a job."

When the one weekly holiday comes the accumulated fatigue of the week's standing is apt to be so great that only the exceptionally robust have the desire for outdoor exercise left in them. The day is therefore only too often used for repose of the body, which, while furnishing relief to the excessively fatigued muscles, does nothing for the remainder of the organism, which would otherwise invite active movement in the open air.

Turning now to the girl in the sitting occupation, I would attract your attention to the frequent occurrence of curvature of the spine, spoken of as "lateral curvature." This deformity is often seen in school children and even in those leading luxurious lives. It betokens a weakness of fiber and a need for physical culture, which is, however, to be controlled by proper treatment. When this is within reach, the progress of the deformity is checked so that it does not become a menace to health, and it is objectionable chiefly as constituting an aesthetic defect which the skillful dressmaker is usually able to conceal.

Were this, however, the extent of the damage done to the organism by lateral curvature, I should have nothing to say of it in this place. It becomes of importance in this connection, however, because it is so frequently seen in girls who have been engaged in sitting occupations during the developmental period and because in them it assumes not only the rôle of a deformity of most severe type, not simply a most unfortunate disfigurement, but also because it now constitutes a very serious menace to health and the attainment of longevity of even average degree.

I shall not discuss the deformity in detail except to say that when assuming the severe grades under discussion it effects reach far beyond the spine itself, which bends not simply to one side or the other, but is always markedly twisted on its vertical axis also. In this twist the chest participates fully, so that not only is its power of expansion greatly interfered with, but its capacity is reduced and much crowding and displacement of the vital organs contained within can be determined.

Small wonder, then, that such severe degree of lateral curvature adds greatly to the likelihood of developing pulmonary consumption, and that the heart can not be thus pushed aside with impunity. It has been ascertained that, for these reasons, the duration of life of individuals with severe lateral curvature is far below the average. The remote effect of the deformity upon the pelvis of the girl I need only mention to the extent of saying that here, too, a distortion and diminution of normal capacity frequently results, so that this has always been recognized by medical men as of potentially serious influence upon the maternal function.

In conclusion, it is to be said that these deformities are by no means confined exclusively to the one sex or the other; neither is it to be interpreted that they occur in every child who works, or even in the greater number. It is asserted, however, that these deformities in the severe forms before referred to are particularly frequent among toiling children or those who have toiled as children.

That the unfavorable influences of premature toil are only too often augmented by unfortunate home influences, by dwellings that are unfit, by insufficient and improper food, does not alter the case. I have aimed to speak of these deformities in particular because of their serious nature and because I have had abundant opportunity for observing them. On the other hand, it is not to be overlooked that these are by no means the only, or even the most common, evidences of physical deterioration to be observed among working children.

SPARGO ON RUIN OF HEALTH.

As to the effect of this work on health, here is the testimony, all supported by the affidavits already given, by Spargo, in his Bitter Cry of the Children, on pages 175-178:

It is a sorry but indisputable fact that where children are employed the most unhealthful work is generally given them. In the spinning and carding rooms of cotton and woolen mills, where large numbers of children are employed, clouds of lint dust fill the lungs and menace the health.

The children have often a distressing cough, caused by the irritation of the throat, and many are hoarse from the same cause.



In bottle factories and other branches of glass manufacture the atmosphere is constantly charged with microscopic particles of glass.

In the woodworking industries, such as the manufacture of cheap furniture and wooden boxes and packing cases, the air is laden with fine sawdust.

Children employed in soap and soap-powder factories work, many of them, in clouds of alkaline dust, which inflames the eyelids and nostrils. Boys employed in filling boxes of soap powder work all day long with handkerchiefs tied over their mouths.

In the coal mines the breaker boys breathe air that is heavy and thick with particles of coal, and their lungs become black in consequence.

In the manufacture of felt hats little girls are often employed at the machines which tear the fur from the skins of rabbits and other animals. Recently I stood and watched a young girl working at such a machine. She wore a newspaper pinned over her head and a handkerchief tied over her mouth.

She was white with dust from head to feet, and when she stooped to pick anything from the floor the dust would fall from her paper head-covering in little heaps.

About 7 feet from the mouth of the machine was a window through which poured thick volumes of dust as it was belched out from the machine. I placed a sheet of paper on the inner sill of the window and in twenty minutes it was covered with a layer of fine dust half an inch deep.

Yet that girl works midway between the window and the machine, in the very center of the volume of dust, sixty hours a week.

These are a few of the occupations in which the dangers arise from the forced inhalation of dust.

In some occupations, such as silk winding, flax spinning, and various processes in the manufacture of felt hats, it is necessary, or believed to be necessary, to keep the atmosphere quite moist. The result of working in a close, heated factory, where the air is artificially moistened, in summer time can be better imagined than described. So long as enough girls can be kept working, and only a few of them faint, the mills are kept going; but when faintings are so many and so frequent that it does not pay to keep going the mills are closed.

The children who work in the dye rooms and print shops of textile factories and the color rooms of factories where the materials for making artificial flowers are manufactured are subject to contact with poisonous dyes, and the results are often terrible. Very frequently they are dyed in parts of their bodies as literally as the fabrics are dyed.

One little fellow, who was employed in a Pennsylvania carpet factory, opened his shirt one day and showed me his chest and stomach dyed a deep, rich crimson. I mentioned the incident to a local physician and was told that such cases were common.

"They are simply saturated with the dye," he said. "The results are extremely severe, though very often slow and for a long time almost imperceptible. If they should cut or scratch themselves where they are so thoroughly dyed, it might mean death."

In Yonkers, N. Y., are some of the largest carpet factories in the United States, and many children are employed in them. Some of the smallest children are employed in the "drum room," or print shop, where the yarns are "printed" or dyed.

Small boys, mostly Slavs and Hungarians, push the trucks containing boxes of liquid dye from place to place, and get it all over their clothing.

They can be seen coming out of the mills at night literally soaked to the skin with dyes of various colors. In the winter time, after a fall of snow, it is possible to track them to their homes not only by their colored footprints, but by the drippings from their clothing. The snow becomes dotted with red, blue, and green, as though some one had sprinkled the colors for the sake of the variegated effect.

The effects of the employment of young boys in glass factories, especially by night, are injurious from every possible point of view. The constant facing of the glare of the furnaces and the red-hot bottles causes serious injury to the sight; minor accidents from burning are common.

Even more serious than the accidents are those physical disorders induced by the conditions of employment. Boys who work at night do not as a rule get sufficient or satisfactory rest by day. Very often they can not sleep because of the noises made by younger children in and around the house; more often, perhaps, they prefer to play rather than to sleep. Indeed, most boys seem to prefer night work, for the reason that it gives them the chance to play during the daytime.

Then you will find further on that when children like these reach the age of 17 and 18 they are utterly exhausted and almost worthless.

Even where the mothers are careful and solicitous, they find it practically impossible to control boys who are wage-earners and feel themselves to be independent. This lack of proper rest, added to the heat and strain of their work, produces nervous dyspepsia.

From working in drafty sheds, where they are often, as one boy said to me in Zanesville, Ohio, "burning on the side against the furnace and pretty near freezing on the other."

They are frequently subject to rheumatism. Going from the heated factories to their homes, often a mile or so distant, perspiring and improperly clad, with their vitality at its lowest ebb, they fall ready victims to pneumonia and to its heir, the great white plague.

In almost every instance when I have asked local physicians for their experience, they have named these as the commonest physical results. Of the fearful moral consequences there can be no question.

The glass blowers themselves realize this, and even more than the physical deterioration, it prevents them from taking their own children into the glasshouses. One practically never finds the son of a glass blower employed as a "snapper-up" or "carrying-in boy" unless the father is dead or incapacitated by reason of sickness.

"I'd sooner see my boy dead than working here. You might as well give a boy to the devil at once as send him to a glass factory," said one blower to me in Glassboro, N. J.; and that is the spirit in which most of the men regard the matter.

#### DOCTOR ROBERTS ON CHILD LABOR AND HEALTH.

As to the effect on health, Dr. Peter Roberts, in his article on "Child labor in eastern Pennsylvania" in the Outlook of December 17, 1904, volume 78 of Outlook, September-December, 1904, on page 984, says:

Can anyone say what thirteen or fourteen hours a day means to these young boys and girls? In my investigation I saw two or three

of the wrecks. One young girl in her seventeenth year had been earning \$9 and \$10 a week, working from seventy to seventy-five hours. She had done it for three years, and is now broken in health and spirits.

Another girl, 18 years of age, having worked for six years in a silk mill, said: "I used to be stout and strong, but now I'm poor enough."

Doctor Weaver, of Easton, who has for the last ten years practiced among the operatives of a hosiery mill which employs some 1,200 hands, said: "Girls when they have been in that mill from 12 years of age to 20 are not much good after."

Upon girls of tender years the blight of factory life falls heaviest. The boy may be stunted or he may grow disproportionately, but the effect upon the mere delicate organism of the female is disastrous and cruel.

Sixty hours a week is more than the average child of tender years can stand, but add another ten hours' overtime and the pressure works disastrously.

Dr. Samuel Davies, president of the State board of health of Pennsylvania, said: "Factory girls soon wilt, and they ill discharge the functions of maternity." Is it surprising?

#### MISS ASHBY ON CHILD RUIN.

Miss Irene M. Ashby, in her article on "Child labor in southern cotton mills," published in the World's Work, volume 2, pages 1292-1293, testifies to the result of this labor on the health of children in the following words:

The flying lint often brings on throat and lung trouble, while pneumonia resulting from the sudden change from the hot factory to the early morning and the late evening mists is not uncommon. These conditions tell far more frequently and fatally on the unformed constitutions of children than on the grown workers.

In one factory I found a little girl aged 10, in the "drawing-in" room, where every individual thread of the warp is drawn through the "harness" of the weaving loom. She could earn as much sometimes as 75 cents a day, though, alas, at the expense of the beautiful blue eyes she turned up to me as I spoke to her.

Her mother told me that she brought her youngest daughter, aged 7, into the mill with her, and although urged to allow her to work, there being many as small in the mill, she would not allow it. Yet without doing any work the child had lost in weight in a year through confinement in the mill atmosphere. Over and over again I was told that the mill was a "playground."

"If anyone tells you that," said a superintendent to me with concentrated scorn, "he either doesn't know what he's talking about or he's telling a downright lie. I've been in the mill since I was 8 years old myself, and I know. We're no charity institution."

"What do you do when you are very tired?" I asked a little girl, putting my mouth close to her ear to make myself heard. "I cry," she said, shyly. She would make no reply when I asked her what happened then, but another child who had literally poked her head into the conversation, put in tersely, "The boss tells her to go on with her work."

#### DOCTOR KOBER'S VIEWS.

Here are extracts from the address of Doctor Kober, of this city, on the physical and physiological effects of child labor.

Doctor Kober says:

There is one phase of the question which strongly appeals to me, and that is the effect of premature and involuntary labor upon the health and the physical welfare of the child.

Physiologists have long since demonstrated that the muscles of the average child attain only at the age of 13 a certain amount of strength and capacity for work. Up to this time the muscular fibers contain a large per cent of water, and in consequence are very tender and immature. As a consequence of this imperfect muscular development it is not surprising that we should find such a large percentage of children engaged in workshops, factories, or even at the writing desk or the merchant counter develop lateral curvature of the spine and other muscular deformities, not to mention their general weakness and predisposition to rickets, tuberculosis, and other pulmonary diseases. All of the bad effects are, of course, very much intensified by unsanitary environments, especially when these occupations are attended by the inhalation of dust, impure air, and injurious gases.

#### DOCTOR HARVEY'S SWORN STATEMENT.

Dr. A. K. P. Harvey, of Washington, who was for years coroner and county physician in New Hampshire and Maine, makes oath as follows concerning his experience as to child labor upon the health:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia:

Personally appeared before, a notary public, A. K. P. Harvey, M. D., who on oath says:

That he was for several years coroner and county physician of Strafford County, N. H., also practicing and city physician of Lewiston, Me., and that he had large opportunities for the observation of children employed in the cotton mills. That these children are especially subject to throat and lung diseases, prominent among which are chronic bronchitis, tuberculosis, and catarrh of the upper air passages, and that inflammation of the eyes is common.

That one or more pathetic features of child labor in these mills is the frequent occurrence of accidents, resulting in the maiming and crippling of the little victims. That by midday these children are tired, and as the day goes by they become more and more fatigued, and hence careless of the dangers by which they are surrounded.

That he has personally treated scores, if not hundreds, of these cases, the injury ranging in severity from the simple crushing of a finger to instant death. To particularize, these accidents consist largely of fingers and hands crushed in cogwheels and other gearing.

That it is not infrequent that an arm is torn off in a machine called the "picker."

That on a visit to one of the largest mills in New Hampshire, in the summer of 1906, in calling the attention of a friend to the prevailing conditions, and standing near the main exit, were noted many children coming out who to all appearances were under 14 years of age, some even appearing as young as 12.

A. K. P. HARVEY, M. D.

Sworn and subscribed to this 23d day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

HERBERT A. GILL,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

## OTHER EVIDENCE ON HEALTH AND CHILD SLAVERY.

Mr. Durland says this about the effect of child labor on health:

Consumption, bronchial affections, anemia are all common ailments among the children of the mills. Their vitality is sapped. They enter the period of womanhood frail and worn out. Yet these are the women expected to bear sons who will carry on great industries that the State may prosper.

Mrs. Van Vorst, in the Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post of May 5, 1906, says:

No doubt one of our children, were he made to work twelve hours a day, would either rise up in juvenile revolt or be carried to an early grave. But to break the spirit that is bowed and pined by accumulated generations of want and need it takes some time, even for the subtlety of the cotton-mill owner. Yet he accomplishes it. There is a wearing out among the mill hands, a gradual breaking down, an inward unhappiness, a sensibility different in kind from what ours would be under similar circumstances, because of the opposite aesthetic chord to which their tastes have been attuned, but no less than ours in degree, and keen enough to make of their lives and of their children's lives one long, slow martyrdom.

Mr. Hubbard says—and don't forget that all this is under oath:

Pneumonia carries off most of them. Their systems are ripe for disease, and when it comes there is no rebound, no response. Medicine simply does not act.

But, Mr. President, perhaps in the interest of the dividends which these mill owners earn—and I shall present a book here written by one of them, showing that the poorest cotton mill in the South does not earn less than 10 and from that up to 30 per cent, and even higher—we might waive consideration of the ruin of the children themselves, but we are confronted with a far graver consequence, and that consequence is this: It is the process of the deterioration of the race. It is the production of a degenerate class in this Republic.

## CHILD LABOR AND RACE DETERIORATION.

The lowest estimate now is that we are pouring into American citizenship every year at least 200,000 London "Hooligans," boys and girls, who are broken in body and stunted in mind and soul, and who know it, and who are living engines of hatred toward society—and I do not blame them—and who become the parents of still other degenerates. We all hear talk about the dangers of a certain "lower class." Had we not better do something to stop the production of that "lower class," that "dangerous class?" Anyhow I shall try to stop it.

Mr. President, what that means in national efficiency is before us. I am not indulging in the least in rhetoric any more on this point than I did before when I was giving specifications of the evil.

Great Britain is an example of precisely a condition such as I have detailed that has shocked the world. The world did not know about it. England herself did not know about it until the United Kingdom had to meet 28,000 Boer farmers in South Africa.

## GREAT BRITAIN'S DEGENERACY.

Now, then, I call it to the minds of Senators. You will remember the newspaper accounts of the almost impossibility of getting soldiers for the English service. You will remember the descriptions of how small and feeble they were. You will remember the tales—true tales—of their being swept off like flies by enteric fever. It was the poorest army that that first of powers ever sent to the battlefield.

This began to come out. First there was a report on the war—just a report on the war—and in this commanding officers, in spite of their desire to make their troops appear as well as possible, which most of them tried to do, were truthful enough to say things like this. This was Professor Ogston. He saw the men from the hospital point of view. He was in charge of the hospital. I read from the official report of the war made to the British Government:

Professor Ogston, who saw the men from the hospital point of view, said that "some of the regiments, especially some of the militia regiments, were physically very inferior and more liable to disease—boys and weeds. In one expedition where a regiment was expected to take part in an advance, over 300 of them—380, I think—were sent for examination as to their physical fitness, and 212 of that part of the regiment so sent for examination were rejected as unfit to sustain the toils of a march and as being liable to disease."

Of the men recruited and attempted to be recruited an average of over 30 per cent were rejected for physical inferiority.

The director-general says that from 40 to 60 per cent of all the soldiers that England recruited for South Africa in the Boer war were unfit for service. This was not the worst. I will read the "Sessional Papers" in a moment to show the causes of rejection. Over 30 per cent of all attempted to be recruited were rejected, although the standard was purposely lowered by the British authorities.

That was not the worst. Of those accepted 2 per cent were almost immediately found unfit for military duty.

And even that was not the worst; because when they were finally in the field, it was found that large numbers of them, when it came to going to the firing line, were incapable of the march; and I just read you the statement from the Royal Report on the war itself, which led up to the investigation from which I am going to read to you in a moment, the statement of Professor Ogston that out of 380, 212 were unable to march to the front.

And still that was not the worst. Of those who actually got to the firing line, fighting with that ancient British pluck never exceeded in the history of this world, thousands were swept off like flies with enteric fever.

All this finally came out. Everybody knew about these rejections. Then there appeared the comments of the British officers, such as Professor Ogston and Lieut. Gen. Sir Archibald Hunter, who said:

But if you get a town-bred population, as most of ours are that enlist now, you have to take them out into the country and show them what is what, and try and teach them what is on the other side of a hill.

Then he said again, speaking of recruiting in Scotland:

Most of the recruits are at present artisans, factory hands, miners, casual laborers, and the proportion drawn from the agricultural class is very small.

## ENORMOUS PERCENTAGE REJECTIONS IN BOER WAR.

It would not have done any good to have tried to get them from the agricultural class, as I shall show in a moment.

Then here are the Sessional Papers of the British Government, showing these rejections which got onto the conscience of the nation, and which startled British statesmen as nothing has startled them in a hundred years. Number medically inspected in 1897, 59,986; total rejections, 22,813; 1898, 66,501 medically inspected; number rejected, 23,287.

I want to pause right here and say that even that does not represent the number of rejections. These were the rejections only of those who were taken by the recruiting officers and medically inspected. But the statement is made in these Sessional Papers and reports that vast numbers of men were rejected offhand by the recruiting officers and never were medically inspected at all.

But of those who were "passed" by the recruiting officers and afterwards medically inspected, an average of more than 33 per cent were rejected. In 1899, 68,059 were medically inspected, and 23,393 rejected. In 1900, 84,402 were medically inspected, and 23,105 were rejected. In 1901 there were 76,750 medically inspected, and 22,286 were rejected. I will not take further time in reading these things that led up to the investigation of the physical deterioration of the British people, because I want to get to that itself.

The statement is here made—I read from the British Sessional Papers—

When examining these totals it must be borne in mind that they do not represent anything like the total number of the rejections of candidates for enlistment into the army. A large number of men are rejected by the recruiters themselves for the causes above mentioned, and in consequence are never medically inspected, and do not appear in any returns.

The cause of these rejections were undersize, narrow chest, bad teeth, bad vision, flat feet, and other causes that showed physical and racial deterioration.

Now, then, when this was brought home to the attention of the British nation and of the world, as I said a moment ago, it startled the British statesmen as nothing had startled them for a hundred years, because they were suddenly face to face with the fact that the United Kingdom, with over 40,000,000 people, found herself hard put to it to raise 320,000 British soldiers to meet 28,000 Boer farmers upon the field of battle.

They were suddenly face to face with the fact that, upon land, England has not the men to meet any first-class nation in the world.

They were suddenly confronted with the fact that while they had become the mistress of the seas in commerce, they had sunk into a low place in manhood and stamina, which is the foundation of all commerce and of all greatness of every kind.

## REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

And so a commission was appointed to examine into and report upon the causes of this physical deterioration of the British people, and here it is in my hand [exhibiting]. It is very voluminous. I intended to read at some length from it, but I will not, because time is so short. I will state rather the conclusions after I give one or two items. Doctor Neston, of Newcastle, said:

There is an undoubted falling off in the physical condition of the infants vaccinated and young persons presented for employment during the last quarter of a century, and this is due to the fact that they are the offspring of town-bred parents, who produce sui generis.



Mr. Harry Wilson, inspector of factories, said:

Personally the poorest specimens of humanity I have ever seen, both men and women, are working in the preparing and spinning departments of certain Dundee jute mills.

This is the report I am reading from:

Another factor in the alleged deterioration of the people, connected like the last with their aggregation in towns, is said to be the withdrawal from the rural districts of the most capable of the population, leaving the inferior types to supply their place and continue the stock, the evil being often aggravated, in the opinion of some, by the drifting into the country of the debilitated town population, which is crowded out by the inrush of more vigorous elements.

Mr. President, in order to save time I shall ask leave to put into the RECORD extracts from this report.

#### CHILD LABOR CAUSE OF BRITISH DETERIORATION.

It was found that a general physical deterioration of the people, which had been revealed first by the lamentable lack of ability to meet the Boers in the field, did exist. It was found that its immediate and present causes were poverty, overcrowding, living in towns, insufficient nourishment, and inherited tendencies. But anyone who has studied the question knows what the cause of that is.

It began in England one hundred and fifty years ago and bore its fruit later in the Boer war. It began in England with the invention of the spinning machines. It began one hundred and fifty years ago, and precisely the same process that is going on in Pennsylvania, in New York, in South Carolina, in Georgia, in North Carolina, in West Virginia, in New Jersey, and other States of the American Republic to-day in 1907 were going on in England a hundred and fifty years ago.

#### CHILD LABOR IN AMERICA IN 1907 EXACT REPRODUCTION OF CHILD LABOR IN ENGLAND IN 1800.

As soon as the factories started up in England in the eighteenth century the mill owners found themselves in precisely the condition that the southern mill owners find their factories to-day. They used *precisely the same arguments to get the children into the mills*. They soon found that the nimble fingers of the children could do the work of attending the machines better than those of old people. Also they soon found that children were more "tractable," more easily "managed," and they found, above all other things, that *they were cheaper*.

And so, first—all Senators are familiar with that, of course—the orphanages were emptied into the mills, and then the country was invaded by the mill owners, just as to-day in the Southern States the hill people are being drawn from their farms to the factories.

The strongest people from the country were induced to go to the factory towns. They left the inferior country people on the farms to run the farms and raise up the future yeomanry of the Empire.

And these stronger young men and young women coming into the factories soon degenerated in health, and they produced children who were weaker still than they were, and so the process went on from bad to worse until seventy-five years later, nearly all the population of England in the meantime having become an urban population, a mill-working population, the great irresistible causes of degeneration had done their work, and when the Boer war came England was hard put to it to raise from among 40,000,000 people 320,000 able soldiers to meet the Boers on the field of battle.

Now, Mr. President, just to show how absolutely similar were the conditions in England one hundred years ago to those we have here; to show that exactly the same process went on there both as to legislation and physical deterioration that is going on here; to show that exactly the same arguments were used by manufacturers and those who stood for them in England one hundred years ago that are being used to-day *almost in exact words*, I want to quote very briefly from this History of Factory Legislation in England, which is perhaps the most complete work of its kind that has ever been written. I have just read you some horrible details about what is existing in this country now. Here is a statement as to the working hours of children, before 1800, in England:

In the framework knitting trade hours were said to be from 5 or 6 a. m. till 10 at night, and large numbers of women and children were thus employed.

Then in 1796 Doctor Percival, of Manchester, laid before the board of health of that town some considerations.

It appears that the children and others who work in the large cotton factories are peculiarly disposed to be affected by the contagion of fever, and that when such infection is received it is rapidly propagated, etc.

Then he goes on to say:

The large factories are generally injurious to the constitution of those employed in them.

Then he says:

The untimely labor of the night and the protracted labor of the day, with respect to children, ~~not~~ only tends to diminish future expectations as to the general sum of life and industry by impairing the strength

and destroying the vital stamina of the rising generation, but it too often gives encouragement to idleness, extravagance, and profligacy in the parents, who, contrary to the order of nature, subsist by the oppression of their offspring.

#### ENGLAND'S REFORMERS BEGAN A CENTURY AGO.

There gradually grew up in England a hundred years ago an agitation such as there is growing up in America now. It was resisted. It was resisted by the factory owners just exactly as the agitation is now being resisted by the factory owners. It is impossible to go into it at this late hour. Sir Robert Peel began the reform of it in 1802. He did not succeed very well; but finally he got the Peel bill passed.

Then it was succeeded by the agitation which resulted in the Sadler bill, which limited the hours of work to ten hours. A very singular thing occurred, and I can not help referring to it now, we are so precisely paralleling the experience of England. The manufacturers resisted the Sadler bill in every way they could. Finally they said: "This bill is being passed upon 'vague' representations; it is being passed at the clamor of working people; let us 'investigate' it; let the whole subject be 'investigated.'"

Of course they knew it would take a year or two in which to "investigate," and in the meantime their enormous profits would go on. Many great fortunes in England to-day are founded upon that system. No wonder England, having thus sowed the wind, is now reaping the whirlwind.

So they asked that the thing might be "investigated," and they carried their point. But so terrible were the conditions, and the report of that investigation committee had so terribly alarmed them, that they aligned themselves for the purpose of delaying and, if possible, defeating action on that report: for the report showed conditions even worse than they were represented, just as the report of the "investigation" in this crime here in America and in the twentieth century will show the Nation, if it is honest.

#### JOHN ASHLEY, EARL OF SHAFTESBURY.

Finally the cause of those English children was taken up by a man whom everybody who reads the English language and knows anything about English history or human industrialism knows and loves and applauds—John Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury. He gave his whole life to it. He gave up his official place; society turned against him; his rich associates reviled him. He was of the noblest nobility of England itself, but they all deserted him. "Shaftesbury," said England's "better classes"—England's "best people," to repeat the favorite phrase of the Senator from Georgia—"Shaftesbury," said they, "has joined the 'lower class.'"

Nevertheless he gave his life to the curing of this infamy, and to-day John Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, is one of the proudest names in English history. When the name of Marlborough is forgotten and when the name of Wellington shall have become a memory the name of John Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, will glow, with ever-increasing radiance, in the permanent heaven of mankind's regard.

They did not succeed in stopping that evil for seventy-five years—these English "reformers," these English sympathizers with the despised "common people," these English lovers of humanity—and it was not until perhaps twenty-five years ago that the evil was entirely ended. The methods of resisting the reforms that are put forward here to-day were put forward there a hundred years ago, and down until a generation ago. Close your eyes, listen to the arguments against ending this practice that you will shortly hear here in the United States Senate in 1907, and you can imagine yourself in the British Parliament eighty years ago.

Does any man think that England pursued a wise policy? I hold in my hand here, which I will read later on this afternoon, the original notes of the statements of some of the mill owners in the Senator's State of North Carolina, where they resisted the passage of a law for the compulsory education of children and improvements over North Carolina's wretched child-labor bill, all of which the manufacturers of North Carolina defeated.

One of them goes on to say: "We want more mills. It is all right to work the children. They say that England is building more mills, and she has become the money center of the world and the commercial mistress of the seas." A manufacturer said substantially that in a statement which I will read, when he was resisting and defeating a child-labor bill in North Carolina.

#### ENGLAND'S HIGH PRICE FOR BECOMING "THE MONEY CENTER OF THE WORLD."

Well, Mr. President, that is what England has done. She has become "the money center of the world," and she has become "the commercial mistress of the seas." But does anybody think that she has not paid too high a price? Does anybody think that the proud eminence upon which she stands in

commerce and trade has not been bought too dearly when it has been bought at the sacrifice of men and women?

The Boer war can teach us a lesson as well as it taught England a lesson. England can not meet *on land* a single first-class power to-day. That is the price she paid for becoming "the commercial mistress of the seas." Gone is that splendid yeomanry which under the Iron Duke overwhelmed the veterans of Austerlitz and bowed to the dust the forehead of the greatest captain of the world. Gone is that splendid stock that produced a Shakespeare and a Milton, and a Thackeray and a Dickens; that produced an Arkwright; that produced the great statesmen of the past. There is not to-day a single English soldier, statesman, or writer who comes even up to the arms of the great Englishmen of yesterday. The English people paid too high a price when they gave their children to make the English mill owners the greatest capitalists in the world.

I respect capital as much as anyone. I respect property as much as any man. I like to see wealth grow and expand, both individually and nationally, but I tell you we are thinking too much about money *as money*. We are thinking too much about prosperity *as prosperity*. The chief use of prosperity is not to put food in your stomachs or clothes on your backs or a roof over your heads. That is an important use; but the great use of prosperity is that it gives you time and strength to think on righteousness and write conscience into laws without ruining the people.

Now, Mr. President, there is the consequence not only of the labor of children to-day, not only the rule of their lives, but the certain deterioration and the establishment of an ever-increasing degenerate class in America.

Mr. President, it has got to stop. I infer from what I have heard here in the interruptions that everybody agrees it has got to stop. As a matter of fact, I have never seen any human reform proposed in this Senate that everybody was not "for" it, but most were against any effective *means* of accomplishing it. We are confronted now with a proposition. I have heard it whispered about the corridors, and so have other Senators, that we must not go "too fast;" that we are bound to have an "investigation."

Oh, no; let us not go "too fast." The evidence is before the Senate of the slow murder of these children, not by tens or hundreds, but by the thousands. But let us not "hasten" to their relief "too fast." Let us "investigate," just as the manufacturers of England asked when they were confronted with the same kind of a reform. "Why not investigate?" said they.

Now, Mr. President, it has got to be stopped and *stopped now*. We all agree upon that—anyhow, everybody says that he agrees it must be stopped; "only," says some, "let us be careful about the Constitution." The Constitution, it appears, is a very mysterious instrument. But never mind; child labor has got to be stopped. How? The States can not stop it. At the beginning of the discussion of the State part of this matter I wish the Senator from South Carolina and the other Senators who apparently intend to oppose this bill to end the evil in their sections of the country, as well as in the North, were here.

"STATES RIGHTS" NOT INVOLVED.

I hear that "States rights" is to be used as the excuse for killing this bill. I say there are no "States rights" involved in this bill. I see the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] making a remark to another Senator upon that statement. If the Senator thinks there are some "States rights" in this bill which prohibits the transportation in interstate commerce of the products of child labor, why did not the Senator think there were some "States rights" in his bill for prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of the boll weevil and the gypsy moth?

Mr. President, something has been said more or less all along about "States rights." But suppose States rights were involved a little bit. Last year we passed the quarantine law. For a hundred years the subject of quarantine has been universally recognized to be exclusively within the province of the States. The effect of the law last year was to make it a national quarantine system. There was not a bit of resistance to it. The people were not willing to quibble; the people were not willing to make a strained construction of the Constitution when yellow fever was knocking at the gates. There was no resistance in the Senate. There was some resistance in the House, made purely upon the "States rights" proposition that it was the province of the State, and that the National Government was taking the right to quarantine from the States. I was very greatly struck by a speech made in the House—

Mr. BACON rose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

I ask to print as a part of my remarks a brief, one-minute speech of Representative DAVEY, of Louisiana, who said he

could not see, as he had seen, the ravages of yellow fever down there and "quibble about the Constitution."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the extract referred to will be printed in the Record.

The extract referred to is as follows:

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire or my intention to delay a vote on this motion. I desire to assure the House that this is one of the most important subjects now before Congress in which our people of the State of Louisiana are interested. If gentlemen who have taken part in this debate had gone through a yellow-fever epidemic, as I have, they would not stand here upon technicalities. I have taken part in every yellow-fever epidemic since my birth during the great epidemic of 1853. I have seen sights that I hope no Member of this House will ever see. I have seen them dying, and I have seen them dead.

Mr. Speaker, there is no law strong enough for me to vote for that would keep the yellow-fever plague from the boundaries of the United States. The people of Louisiana to-day are feeling unrestful about the coming season. It is not that the quarantine time is coming, but it is here, and unless there be some relief given within a very short time, it would be useless, as it could do no good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that I may not waste the time of the House, I ask for a vote on this question. [Applause.]

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the spirit of a humane man; but if we could speak thus for a bill to kill yellow fever, how much more should we speak for a bill to kill child labor?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. BACON. I will not take but a minute of the Senator's time. I wish simply to say that the Senator is mistaken as to the provisions of the quarantine law. It is purely a maritime quarantine law. It goes to the extent of exclusion from the country, but, so far as interstate matters are concerned, the quarantine law has no provision whatsoever. On the contrary, when it passed—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I definitely stated that the practical effect of that law—I know what was done to it when it got to the Senate—but the practical effect and practical intent of the bill was that we should have a National quarantine system, because everybody saw how perfectly foolish the other system was. If yellow fever got into the port of Mobile, though it was kept out of the ports of other States, it would cross State lines just the same. Yellow fever does not know anything more about State lines than a passenger train does.

If we would not quibble about the constitutionality of the quarantine law to protect the people from yellow fever, which does not kill a hundred people in twenty years, we ought not to quibble about the constitutionality of a law to stop a practice that kills thousands of people every year, and those people children.

STATES CAN NOT END THE EVIL.

Mr. President, why is it that the States can not stop this evil? In the first place, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] by his question furnished me the text. If one State passes good laws and enforces them and another State does not, then the business men in the former State are at a business disadvantage with the business men in the latter State.

The business man in the State that has the good laws suffers from the very righteousness of that State's laws, and the business man in the State that has bad laws profits by the very wickedness of that State's laws.

The Senator will agree that it is common sense as well as Americanism that every business man beneath the flag ought to have equal business opportunities so far as the law can give them to him.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. That last remark of the Senator is so broad I am afraid the Senator will revise it when he comes to the question of the protective tariff, and certain industries and certain classes are protected to the detriment—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am coming to that in a minute.

Mr. TILLMAN. I think that the good sense and the love of humanity in any State, where it is pointed to properly, will redress this wrong and cure the evil, or kill it, if the facts are ever presented to the people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the Senator would not object to having the Nation do it if the Senator believed that it was entirely within the province of the Nation to do it?

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator can convert me on that point, I will be ready to go with him, but I want to call the Senator's attention to another phase of it. We have in the South a very large number of children from 6 years up who help pick cotton in the fall. Would the Senator have the cotton crop stopped from entering into interstate commerce because little children are engaged in helping to gather it?



Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well. Still if the Senator's bill does not differentiate the kinds of labor and protect us in some way or other, it will be so broad and sweeping that I am afraid it will go too far.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator has not read the bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not read it. Why should I read it until the time comes to vote on it? I have not had time to read it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is very short, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I know the general proposition involved, which is that Congress shall pass a law to prohibit entering into interstate commerce articles produced in factories by children, or something of that sort.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is right.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is about the substance of it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That has nothing to do with picking cotton.

Mr. TILLMAN. Picking cotton, however, is an industry in which children engage, and they begin at a very early age, and they begin very early in the morning.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So far as this measure is concerned, it lets them pick cotton. If the Senator had been here when I began my speech he would have heard me say that I have no objection to the working of children in the open air; that I think labor on a farm within their strength is a good thing; that I think one of the best features of our educational system is the manual-training schools of our cities, by far the best schools that we have; that I expect to live to see the day when we shall have as a part of the system of education the teaching of children how to work.

That is not what this bill strikes at. This bill strikes at the personal infamy and the national danger of child's labor in factories and mills and sweatshops, and nothing else.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator from South Carolina suggests that the children of South Carolina engage in picking cotton. The Senator from Indiana says he does not purpose by this bill to prohibit the shipment of cotton as an article of interstate commerce. But I ask the Senator if the principle is not exactly the same?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will come to that. I know exactly what the Senator is going to ask. He is going to ask if we can exclude the products of the factory, can we not exclude the products of the farm? Certainly we can, as a matter of *power*; but we never will as a matter of *policy*. The possible abuse of a power is no argument against its existence. I will come to that presently, but I do not want to get away from my questions of fact.

Mr. FULTON. Let me ask the Senator if Congress can prohibit cotton from being shipped from one State to another because it was picked by children—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; or a redheaded girl.

Mr. FULTON. Can it not prohibit wheat from being shipped from one State to another because a person was employed more than eight hours?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why, undoubtedly; as a matter of *power*; though that has nothing to do with this bill. This bill rests on much narrower foundations.

Mr. FULTON. Then there is nothing that Congress can not regulate in our internal affairs.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will answer that question. I am glad the Senator has brought that question up. Let us meet the questions of human industry face to face and vote on them. As long as I am in public life I am prepared to vote on any question that arises, and I never shall shield myself and excuse myself from voting upon them with any strained constitutional construction. Now, I will say to the Senator that I have had in mind—

Mr. FULTON. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Wait a minute.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; just a minute. I am on the point the Senator mentions precisely, and I intend when I come to the legal part of it to argue it at length. If the Senator does not mind to wait until I get to that part, I don't want to have my argument disarranged.

Mr. FULTON. It is as to this point—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator says he never shielded himself

behind the Constitution. I assume the Senator does not mean to say that he believes if Congress is without constitutional power to enact certain legislation he will nevertheless insist on voting on it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, most certainly I do not, I will say to the Senator; most certainly I do not.

Now that the Senator has asked that question, I would not be surprised that a good deal of anxiety about the constitutionality of this bill is wrapped up in that very eight-hour question. It may be that many people hope that this is unconstitutional, so that they will not have to vote on it and the whole group of questions associated with it.

Now I am going to argue the *power* of this question later on, and I wish the Senator would let me get through with the facts.

Mr. FULTON. Let me say to the Senator in answer that he does not mean it, I am sure, and yet his answer assumes more sincerity to himself than he imputes to others.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the very question the Senator from Wisconsin asked me. Certainly I assume that every man here—no, not every man here; I don't think, no—but I think most of us, have about equal sincerity. I do not think we all have. I do not think all human people are alike. I know it is a polite thing to say they are all equally sincere, but as a matter of fact we are not. The Senator from Wisconsin asked me if I was any more earnestly interested in this child labor than anybody else and I told him I thought I was.

#### STATES NEVER HAVE UNIFORM LAWS.

Mr. President, the next reason why the States can not adequately handle this question is because neither in this nor in any other important question have the States ever succeeded in having uniform laws; and it is clear that this evil can not be remedied unless there are *uniform laws upon it*.

Suppose, for example, that Ohio passes an excellent child-labor law and my State repeals ours, instantly every manufacturing establishment in my State would drain the child labor from Ohio to us, because it is cheaper and more profitable, and the manufacturers of Ohio would be at a disadvantage with the manufacturers of Indiana.

Not only that, but if every single State in the Union but one were to enact a good law and execute it (and I will show you in a minute that they do not and that they can not—and I will show you why they do not and can not), nevertheless the one State that did not and that continued to permit the infamy that exists in many of the States now that I have referred to to-day would be ruining citizens not of that State only, but citizens of the Nation also.

A child that grows up in New York and becomes a citizen is not alone a citizen of New York. He is a citizen of the Republic as well. He does not vote exclusively if he is in North Carolina for North Carolina candidates. He votes for the President of the Republic; he votes for members of the legislature that elect a United States Senator; he votes for a Congressman. He is as much a citizen of the Nation as he is a citizen of the State, and when any system of labor or of lack of education ruins him for citizenship in the State he is ruined for citizenship in the Nation.

So not only, Mr. President, is there inequality of business opportunities, but by that inequality the ruin of citizens in any one State, the murder of the innocents in any one Commonwealth, affects the entire Republic as much as it affects that State.

Senators who are sincerely anxious about the question of the rights and the dignity of the States must not also forget the rights and the dignity and the future of the Nation. We have not any right to permit any State to produce in this Republic a degenerate class unfit for citizenship beneath the flag, because they vote at National ballot boxes as well as State ballot boxes, if any exercise of our power under the Constitution can prevent it.

Now, Mr. President, there can not be any uniformity. There is not. Here is an abstract of the State laws upon the subject of child labor. There are not six of them alike. Some have no child-labor laws at all; others are worse than any laws, because they are pretenses at labor legislation which make the people and the country think that something has been done, when, as a matter of fact, nothing has been done, and the ruin that went on before without the sanction of the law continues under the sanction of the law.

#### ABSTRACT OF STATE LAWS.

I am going to read, just to show how inadequate, how inharmonious, these are, a few of these laws:

##### ALABAMA.

Age limit for working in mines, 12 years. Age limit for working in factories, 12 years; night work in factories, 13 years. Orphans and children of dependent parents between 10 and 12 years are allowed to

work in factories. Children under 12 can work sixty-six hours a week. Parents furnish sworn certificate of the age and birth of the child. No factory inspection.

For the purposes of execution that law might just as well not exist. There is no factory inspection even then.

Now, let us go on to some others, because I have not time to read them all:

#### GEORGIA.

Age limit for children in factories, 12 years; orphans and children of dependent parents, 10 years—

Later on in this debate—not to-day—I intend, if any Senator raises the question, to go more extensively into the widow question, or, what is known among the men and women who have studied this question all their lives through, as the “widow-woman fraud,” in relation to child labor. It is a shameful and a pitiful excuse, under which more children are ground to death than anybody who had not examined the subject would believe.

#### GEORGIA.

Age limit for children in factories, 12 years; orphans and children of dependent parents, 10 years; age limit for illiterate children, 14 years; for night work, 14 years. After January 1, 1908, children under 18 required to attend school twelve weeks of each year. Certificates furnished by parents. No factory inspection. No age limit for work in mines.

As a matter of practical execution that law might just as well not exist. I have given evidence here in extreme abundance as to how age certificates are obtained in Pennsylvania, where they do have factory inspection. With reference to that, I perhaps had better stop right here and call the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to what I said a moment ago about the condition which has prevailed since this law went into effect.

#### CORRECTION OF A MISSTATEMENT.

I read from the Atlanta Journal of January 6, 1907. It corrects my statement a moment ago:

[From Atlanta Journal, January 5, 1907.]

Despite the fact that the child-labor bill became effective in Georgia January 1, it is nevertheless estimated by Ordinary Wilkinson—

I believe that is the county clerk, or some equivalent officer there—

that in Fulton County alone—

I was wrong. It is not in the State, but in Fulton County alone—

that in Fulton County alone during the current year between 2,000 and 3,000 children under 12 years of age may be put to work in the factories.

That is “isolated”—that is, “occasional.” It could not be that our “best people” would ever work that many children after the passage of the new law.

This seeming infraction of the spirit of the new law becomes possible in this manner:

Though a child may be under the prescribed age, if he is an orphan or has a widowed mother or a disabled father, and any one of these conditions be shown to the ordinary under the oath of child or parent, a certificate will be issued by the ordinary permitting the child to work in a factory.

I said to the Senator from Georgia that the law of his State is not worth the paper it is written on; it is just what the factory people want; and it permits this infamy to go on under the sanction of law, whereas it had to go on heretofore without the approval of the statute. Now, let us see. I am reading from one of that State's papers—the Atlanta Journal:

In every case the evidence must be written out in detail and filed for inspection by the grand jury. This method, of course, throws a safeguard about the bill; but, as has been pointed by mill owners, the absence of any birth record in Fulton County makes fraud under such instances highly and frequently possible.

Of prime interest to the ordinary's office just at present is the immense increase of work that the operation of the new bill has entailed. The registration and examination of each candidate for one of the permits mentioned requires, says the ordinary, at least an hour's time. Nor does the bill provide extra pay or assistance for this additional work.

All they have got to do is to show, not age alone, but that only one of three conditions exist; and to show that in any way—by a certificate; and there is no factory inspection. The law is a dead letter; and the ordinary of Fulton County estimates that in the present year and in that one county 3,000 children will be put to work, notwithstanding your new law.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. BACON. I simply rise to say that the Senator in his statement of this law is not entirely correct, and while I will not interrupt him to discuss that proposition I will, after he concludes, as he will not permit me to read the law now—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I can not do it, because time is flying.

Mr. BACON. I want to say that at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks I myself, in my own time, intend to put the Georgia law in the Record and let the public judge whether the Senator is correct or is mistaken.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator will; but, as one of the Senator's best friends, I hope the Senator will not defend that law or attempt to deny the condition existing in his own State, because if the Senator does I will tell the Senator that I do not think he is familiar with conditions in his own State.

Mr. BACON. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his repeated estimate of my various faculties as to information, etc.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I could not help it when the Senator said it was “occasional and isolated.” I did not say it. The Senator from Georgia said it.

#### NEW JERSEY.

Age limit for children working in factories and mines, 14 years. Hours of labor, fifty-five per week, and night work forbidden except in canning establishments and glassware. Factory inspection.

#### NORTH CAROLINA.

Age limit for children working in factories, 12 years. Children under 18 not required to work more than sixty-six hours per week—eleven hours per day. Written statement of age of child furnished by parents. No provision for children working in mines. No factory inspection.

Yet the Senator from North Carolina states that they have an admirable child-labor law down there—that is, in North Carolina—and I have the official notes of the stenographer reporting the speeches those North Carolina mill owners made in their successful resistance to any improvement in the law at the last session of the North Carolina legislature.

Oregon has one of the very best laws in the country and South Carolina has one of the worst. I guess there is only one worse than that, and that is the law of West Virginia, which is the worst in the whole country.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 12 years. Orphans and children of dependent parents allowed to work at any age in textile factories. Night work forbidden for children under 12 years of age. Hours of labor, sixty-six hours per week. Parents required to furnish certificates of age. No factory inspection.

#### WEST VIRGINIA.

Age limit for children in mines and factories, 12 years. No factory inspection.

That is all for West Virginia, where captains of industry thrive.

Wisconsin undoubtedly has the best law of any of them. But to read an abstract of them all takes too much time; so I ask leave to insert an abstract of these laws in my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Permission will be granted, in the absence of objection.

The abstract referred to is as follows:

#### ALABAMA.

Age limit for working in mines, 12 years. Age limit for working in factories, 12 years; night work in factories, 13 years.

Orphans and children of dependent parents between 10 and 12 years are allowed to work in factories.

Children under 12 can work sixty-six hours a week.

Parents furnish sworn certificate of the age and birth of the child.

No factory inspection.

Acts of 1903.

#### ARKANSAS.

Age limit for working in mines, 14 years; for illiterate children, 16 years.

Age limit for working in factories, 12 years; orphan children and children of dependent parents, 10 years.

Age limit for night work, 14 years; age limit for illiterate children, 14 years. Children under 14 years are required to attend school twelve weeks of each year while working in factories.

Certificate of parents as to ages of children.

Acts of 1903.

#### CALIFORNIA.

Age limit for children in factories, 12 years. Children under 18 not allowed to work more than nine hours a day. Parents required to furnish certificates of age.

Acts of 1901.

#### COLORADO.

Age limit for children in mines, 14 years; illiterate children, 16 years. Children under 16 not allowed to work in mines or factories more than eight hours a day. Employment of children under age, or hiring out by parents, a crime punished by a fine or imprisonment, or both.

Acts of 1903.

#### CONNECTICUT.

Age limit for children in factories, 14 years; illiterate children, 16 years, unless attending night school. Parents furnish certificates; factory inspection by school authorities.

Acts of 1902.

#### DELAWARE.

Age limit for children in factories, 14 years, except for children in canneries. Factory inspection.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

No child-labor law for factories.

#### FLORIDA.

No child-labor law.

#### GEORGIA.

Age limit for children in factories, 12 years; orphans and children of dependent parents, 10 years; age limit for illiterate children, 14 years; for night work, 14 years. After January 1, 1908, children under 18 required to attend school twelve weeks of each year. Certificates furnished by parents. No factory inspection. No age limit for work in mines.



## IDAHO.

Age limit for children working in mines, 14 years. No factory inspection.

## ILLINOIS.

Age for children working in mines, 14 years. Age limit for children working in factories, 14 years. Age limit for illiterate children, 16 years. Documentary proof required for age certificate, furnished by school authorities. Excellent factory inspection. Age limit for night work, 16 years. Hours of labor, *forty-eight a week*. Acts of 1903.

## INDIANA.

Age limit for children working in factories and mines, 14 years. Hours of labor for children under 14 years, *eight hours per day*; between 14 and 16, *ten hours per day*. Age limit for illiterate children, 16 years. Excellent factory inspection. Acts of 1901.

## IOWA.

Age limit for work in mines and factories, 14. Age limit for night work and for work in dangerous employments, 16. Certificates required for all children under 16. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1905.

## KANSAS.

Age limit for children working in mines, 12 years. Illiterate children, 16 years. Age and schooling certificates furnished by school authorities. No factory inspection.

## KENTUCKY.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 14 years. Age limit for night work, 16 years. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1905.

## LOUISIANA.

Age limit for children working in factories: Boys, 12 years; girls, 14 years. Age limit for illiterate children, 14 years. Hours of labor for children under 18 years, *sixty a week*. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1906.

## MAINE.

Age limit for children working in factories, *12 years*. Illiterate children, 15 years. Girls under 18 and boys under 16 years not to be employed more than *ten hours per day*. Certificates made by children or parents. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1887.

## MARYLAND.

Age limit for children in mines and factories, 12 years. Children under 16 years required to furnish certificates as to physical condition and schooling certificate. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1905.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Age limit for children in factories, 14 years. Age limit for illiterate children, 16 years. No minors shall be employed between 10 p. m. and 6 a. m. Hours of labor for children under 18 not more than *fifty-eight* in one week nor *ten* in one day. Age and schooling certificate signed by superintendent of school. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1902.

## MICHIGAN.

Age limit for children in factories, 14 years. Dangerous occupations, 16 years. Hours of labor for boys under 18 not more than *sixty hours per week*. Age limit for night work, 16 years. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1901.

## MINNESOTA.

Age limit for children working in mines or factories, 14 years. Dangerous occupations, 16 years. Age limit for night work, 16 years. Hours of labor for children under 16 not more than *sixty hours per week*. Age and schooling certificates signed by superintendent of schools. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1895.

No child-labor law.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Age limit for children in mines, 12 years. Illiterate children, 14 years. Age limit for children working in factories, 14 years. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1901.

## MONTANA.

Children under 14 years of age not to be employed during the school term, nor children of 16 during the school term unless they can read and write. *Factory inspection* by truant officers. Person employing or hiring a child under 14 in mines or factories punishable by fine. Acts of 1895.

## NEBRASKA.

Age limit, 14, in factories. *No factory inspection*.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Age limit for children working in factories, 12 years; during the school term, 16 years. Hours of labor for children under 18 years not more than *sixty per week*. No factory inspection. Acts of 1901.

## NEW JERSEY.

Age limit for children working in factories and mines, 14 years. Hours of labor, *fifty-five per week*, and night work forbidden, except in canning establishments and glassware. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## NEW YORK.

Age limit for children working in mines, 16 years, and factories, 14 years; illiterates in factories, 16 years. Night work forbidden for children under 16 years. Hours of labor for children under 18 years, *sixty per week*. Dangerous employment forbidden for children under 18. Employment certificates issued by the board of health. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Age limit for children working in factories, *12 years*. Children under 18 not required to work more than *sixty-two hours per week*—eleven hours per day. Written statement of age of child furnished by parents. No provision for children working in mines. *No factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Age limit for children in mines and factories, 12 years. No factory inspection. Children under 14 required to attend school twelve

weeks per year. Hours of labor for children under 14 years, *ten hours per day*.

## OHIO.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 14 years. Night work forbidden to boys under 16 years and girls under 18. Age limit for illiterate children, 16 years. Age and schooling certificates signed by superintendent of schools. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1902.

## OKLAHOMA.

No child-labor laws.

## OREGON.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 14 years. Age limit for illiterate children, 16 years. Age limit for night work, 16 years. Hours of labor for children under 16, not exceeding *ten hours per day*. Affidavits for age furnished by parents. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Age limit for children working in mines, 16 years. Age limit for children working in factories, 14 years. Hours of labor not more than *sixty hours per week*. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1905.

## PORTO RICO.

Children under 16 not allowed to work over *nine hours per day*.

Acts of 1902.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Age limit in factories, 14; night work, 16. Children under 16 required to furnish certificates. *Factory inspection*.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 12 years. Orphans and children of dependent parents allowed to work at any age in textile factories. Night work forbidden for children under 12 years of age. Hours of labor, *sixty-six per week*. Parents required to furnish certificates of age. *No factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Age limit for children working in mines, 14 years. Children between the ages of 8 and 15 not permitted to work in factories unless they attend school twelve weeks of the year. Certificates furnished by school authorities. *No factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## TENNESSEE.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 14 years. Parents required to furnish sworn certificates of age. *Factory inspection*. Acts of 1901.

## TEXAS.

Age limit for children working in factories, 12 years. Age limit for children working in mines, 16 years. Age limit for illiterates, except children of dependent parents, —. Age limit for night work in factories, 14 years. Employment of children under legal age punishable by fine for each offense. *No factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## UTAH.

Age limit for children working in mines, 14 years. No factory inspection. Acts of 1898.

## VERMONT.

Age limit for children working in factories, 12 years. Children under 16 years not permitted to work during school hours unless they have completed elementary course of study of 9 years. Age limit for children working after 8 o'clock p. m., 16 years. Town superintendents of schools empowered to inspect factories. Acts of 1906.

## VIRGINIA.

Age limit for children working in factories, 12 years. For night work, 14 years. Parents of employees knowingly violating the act punishable by fine. *No factory inspection*. Acts of 1903.

## WASHINGTON.

Age limit for children working in mines, 14 years. Children under 15 working in factories required to attend school — of a year. Age limit for children in factories, 14 years. Children of dependent parents, 12 years. No factory inspection. Acts of 1903.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Age limit for children in mines and factories, 12 years. *No factory inspection*.

## WISCONSIN.

Age limit for children working in mines and factories, 16 years, unless he obtains a permit from the factory inspector or county judge. No child under 14 employed under any circumstances. *Factory inspection*. Children under 18 not allowed to work more than *eight hours per day*. Acts of 1903.

## WYOMING.

Age limit for children working in mines, 14 years. Employment of children under 14 in mines punishable by fine. No factory inspection. Acts of 1899.

## SUMMARY.

Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Utah, Washington, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming already have an age limit of 14 years for children in mines and factories, while Alabama, California, Georgia, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina, North Dakota, Virginia, West Virginia, South Carolina, Missouri, and New Hampshire have an age limit of 12 years. Alabama and Georgia allow children of 10 years to work in factories *sixty-six hours a week* if they are orphans or children of dependent parents, while Vermont allows children of 12 years to work except during the school term, and South Carolina allows children of any age to work in cotton factories who are children of dependent parents. Arkansas has an age limit of 12 years for factories, 10 years for children of dependent parents, but 14 years for children working in mines, and 14 years for illiterate children. Alabama forbids night work for children under 13 years of age. Georgia has an age limit of 14 years for illiterate children. Louisiana has an age limit of 14 years for girls and 12 for boys working in factories. Maryland has an age limit of 16 years for illiterate children. Virginia forbids night work for children under 14 years. South Dakota has an age limit of 14 for mines, but

allows children of 8 to work in factories if they attend school twelve weeks in a year. Missouri has an age limit of 12 years for children in mines, but 14 years for children in factories, while Texas has an age limit of 12 years for factories and 16 years for mines. A United States Statute, acts of 1891, forbids the employment of children under 12 years of age in mines in any Territories.

Mr. OVERMAN. How about Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Indiana law is about the third or fourth best in the country. It is an admirable law. The age limit there for children working in factories and mines is 14 years, and the law provides for factory inspection. We have a good factory inspection, but not as good as that in Illinois, which is admirable, notwithstanding which I propose to show the law is violated there just now, as I have no doubt it is in my State, although none of the investigators have pointed it out in my State. Still we violate the law I have no doubt, for States can not properly deal with this National evil. Manufacturers of a State having a good law will violate it because of the competition of States having bad laws. Uniformity is the only remedy.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me for just a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have here Bulletin 68, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, on child labor, which shows that in Evansville, Ind., 12.5 per cent of the breadwinners are between 10 and 15 years of age, and in Indianapolis 9.9 per cent of the breadwinners are of that early age. So that in Indiana the law is being violated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I said it was. I stated that to the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I say we have in Indiana an excellent child-labor law and an excellent inspection law; but it is violated there, though not to the extent to which it is being violated elsewhere. *But to the extent to which it is being violated, we have just that large percentage of infamy.*

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator on that point that in eighty cities of the country, having at least 50,000 inhabitants each, the per cent is 10.3 and in Indiana it is 11.2.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But take the cities as a whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. Those are the only cities reported in Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say, notwithstanding the excellent factory inspection, I am going to show that in Illinois, whose law comes as nearly as possible to being perfect, it is violated. The truth about it is that the States are incompetent to deal with this question. *You have got to have a uniform law.*

You have got to have the manufacturer feel that at any time, upon the application of any citizen, of any good woman who sees him take a child to work whom she knows to be under age, to apply to a court of justice, have him haled by the United States district attorney before the United States district court, and let him face the prison bars. That will increase the manufacturer's watchfulness.

If you depend upon the parents to furnish certificates and let the manufacturers obtain the labor of these children, of course you can not get laws enforced; but when the manufacturer himself knows that he must err, if he errs at all, upon the right side, and that if he errs upon the wrong side, he will find the penitentiary opening to him as the consequence, he will take mighty good care that he does know the age of the children whom he employs.

#### WHY STATES DO NOT PASS OR ENFORCE GOOD LAWS.

Mr. President, another reason why it is that the States can not care for this matter is that in those States where this evil is worst—and I will not now name them—the great interests that are becoming rich from this practice have always in the past been powerful enough to prevent righteous legislation; and in no instance, as I shall show by extracts I will put in the Record, have they failed to take advantage of that. Time after time they have defeated such legislation in Pennsylvania and in every one of the Southern States, as the Senator from South Carolina pointed out a moment ago, and even when the pressure of public opinion becomes such that a law is passed, as is the case with the North Carolina law now, it is constantly violated, as I shall show by sworn testimony that I propose to give in a moment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator says that in the State of Wisconsin they have the best child-labor law in America—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. And that they also have an excellent child-labor law in Illinois—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. They have.

Mr. OVERMAN. And yet those laws are constantly violated?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, can Congress pass a law that will not be violated?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think we can make a law, if you will vote for it—but will you?—that will not be violated more than four or five times. When you put behind the bars a man who has wrung his money out of the blood of children, the remainder of such men will quit doing it. They are looking out for their own pocketbooks and their own persons.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator's last observation leads me, with his permission, to ask him a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think Congress has the power to enact a child-labor law, the violation of which in Wisconsin would be visited with imprisonment?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Undoubtedly, if they ship the goods made by those children on an interstate railway.

Mr. SPOONER. No; the Senator does not answer my question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I will answer that most certainly I think so.

Mr. SPOONER. That answers my question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I answer your question, and I will go on and answer it some more. I will say to the Senator Congress can, in my judgment, pass such a law as I was trying to explain a moment ago. This proposed law is so drawn that every sincere States-rights man can vote for it without violating his constitutional convictions. I drew it in that way. Otherwise I would have drawn it upon the theory of the meat-inspection law. If we had a right to put inspectors into a packing house to inspect a packing house and to see that they did not can and prepare diseased meat, I know of no reason why we could not do the same thing with manufacturing establishments.

I decline to debate that point now, because that is not up; but what I do say to the Senator is this: I would not pretend for a moment that we have the right to make a law for a State that would affect the child labor in that State exclusively. *That, however, is not the question before us.*

We have a right to pass a law applying to any factory or mine owner in Wisconsin who ships his products out of the State. I will demonstrate that to your satisfaction later, because I have studied the question, and when I come to the legal part of my argument I will show that we have control over the shipment of products of child labor over interstate railways.

Mr. SPOONER. We have all examined this subject more or less in connection with questions which have arisen here. I only want to get at the Senator's proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not on that proposition yet, but I will deal with it presently. I am not on that proposition now.

Mr. SPOONER. But I am on the proposition now. The Senator's proposition, as I understand it, is that Congress has the power to enact, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, a law which will be operative to regulate adequately—or not at all—child labor in the States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In factories, mines, and sweatshops in the States.

Mr. SPOONER. Child labor in the States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; child labor in the States.

Mr. SPOONER. Engaged in the manufacture of a product for transportation from State to State?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; even agriculture.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me a word further, that statement is based upon the proposition that the power of Congress over interstate commerce is absolute; that it may prohibit the transportation of any product from State to State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; that is precisely the proposition that I intend to argue, and I will present to the Senator some decisions upon it. Of course I suppose that this ought not to be done. We have an instrumentality which is supposed to instruct us upon this subject, and we ourselves ought not to debate the constitutionality of it until we hear from that tribunal.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?



Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. I suppose the Senator refers to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I prefer to debate that question when it comes up.

Mr. SPOONER. It will come up.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not suppose it will; I do not know whether it will come up or not, unless the Senator can give out a fiat here.

Mr. SPOONER. I can give a fiat for myself, at least.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, you did give a fiat to the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You presented a resolution referring the question—

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. To the Judiciary Committee, which, of course, would make the Senator chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which was to advise the Senate upon the constitutionality of the question. Of course that assumed that the committee having the bill in charge—the Committee on Education and Labor—was not competent to pass upon the matter, and that the other Senators here were not competent to pass upon it.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, no.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, I think that is a subject that will bear some discussion when the thing comes up.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have been a member of the Senate a good many years—longer than the Senator from Indiana has been—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SPOONER. Although I do not expect, if I should remain here very much longer, to know as much as the Senator does. But it has often happened during my relatively short experience that the Senate has called upon the Judiciary Committee to advise it as to what it might, so far as that committee's opinion went, within constitutional limits, do in the way of legislation. The Senator is quite mistaken when he speaks of me as having issued any fiat. Several bills were pending here on this subject, about which I had then and have now doubt—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You have more than that.

Mr. SPOONER. And to which, perhaps, on reconsideration, the Senator might not give his approbation. I said I had doubt.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought I had understood the Senator heretofore to express more than that.

Mr. SPOONER. No, Mr. President; I do not know what the Senator thought he understood, but I know what I thought and what the condition of my mind was. I did not consider it any usurpation. I conceived it to be a legitimate function to introduce a resolution in the Senate to instruct the Judiciary Committee to report its opinion upon a question. The fiat lay in the adoption by the Senate of the resolution placing the matter before the committee; but I do not intend to express my opinion about it in the Senator's speech.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator will. I have already, while the Senator was out, invited any Senator here who wanted to at any time to ask me any question, either about the facts or the law, so that if I were wrong I might be corrected.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course I shall ask for information of the Senator, because I am on the Judiciary Committee, and I want the advice of the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator that I am permitting him to interrupt me, but I do not understand why the Senator should throw out that last suggestion. Of course I can not give the Senator any information, nor can anybody else.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; the Senator can.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, I might; but the Senator does not think so.

Mr. SPOONER. If I did not think the Senator could, I would not ask him.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I decline to take any time at this juncture to discuss the practice which is growing up here of a Junior Supreme Court to relieve the Supreme Court itself of all its constitutional functions and the Senate of all its constitutional responsibilities. I will not take any time for that now, but I shall be glad to debate that when it comes up, both as to the fact and as to the propriety and policy of it. For myself, I think it is extremely dangerous. I do not think, even with the limitations which the Senator was so kind as to suggest, that I will have very much difficulty in showing the danger in that practice.

Mr. SPOONER. I have no doubt that the Senator can do so.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire to get to the legal part of my argument, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator in speaking of the difficulty in enforcing the State laws said that often, where perfect laws were enacted, mill owners would prevent the perfect and effective administration of the law. In other words, if I understand the Senator, his argument is based very largely upon the presumption that local self-government is a failure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. By no manner of means. I am surprised that the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have an affection as great as is my admiration—and he knows it, too—should deal with this serious question in that light vein.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, Senators on this side of the Chamber are unable to hear the debate.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator knows perfectly well that I am as earnest a defender of local self-government within its proper limits as is the Senator, and that I do not believe for a single minute that the failure of the State laws to grapple with a situation like this means the failure of local self-government.

Mr. CARMACK. If the Senator will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CARMACK. I was stating what I conceive to be the logical conclusion of the Senator's argument. The Senator was giving reasons why the State laws would not accomplish the object, and one of the reasons given by him was that even where State laws, perfect in themselves, were enacted, the corrupt influence of mill owners was such that the laws could not be enforced. I say the logical conclusion of that is that the Senator bases his position very largely upon the assumption that local self-government is a failure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the way it may look to the Senator from Tennessee.

#### FAILURE TO ENFORCE STATE LAWS.

Mr. President, I will ask the Senate to permit me to present affidavits from a large number of persons concerning law violations in a number of these States, particularly in the southern cotton mills and the coal breakers of Pennsylvania.

Here is Mr. Lovejoy's report of one of his investigations. His affidavit to its truth is already in the record. I want to call attention to one from New Jersey. These are all specific. They give names; they give ages; they give places, and draw the necessary conclusions. Here is the case of a girl who works in New Jersey from twelve to fourteen hours a day. She was 15 years of age and had been taken out of school at 12.

Mr. Lovejoy proceeds now to give examples, giving names and dates and places:

Willie Mudamovitch—

That is a foreign name, you see. All of the names that I am going to give now for the next few minutes are foreign names; but because these are the children of foreigners is that any reason why they should be ruined for citizenship?

A little later, if it strikes any Senator here that because they are "foreigners"—Huns or Slavs—therefore the matter is minimized, I shall, by the time Senators on the other side get through with their lunch, make even worse citations from that portion of the country where is found, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] the other day most truthfully said, the purest strain of Anglo-Saxon blood to be found on the continent.

I shall show by sworn testimony that those children are being ruined for citizenship, pure American strain though they be, as surely as are the foreign children in the breakers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Lovejoy goes on. This is from his article in the Woman's Home Companion, to the truth of which he makes affidavit:

Willie Mudamovitch, of Shenandoah. He is but 10 years old and has been working in the breaker at odd times during the past year.

So he began work at 9 years of age.

He weighs 63 pounds, and was found hungry and dressed in rags at the Lehigh Valley station during the suspension of mining in May.

Walter Wilcowsky—

A foreigner—

Walter Wilcowsky, of Girardville—

Then he goes on to describe the town; but there is no use of my taking your valuable time for that—

Walter was 13 years old the 9th of last December and began to pick slate in one of the large collieries on the estate five weeks before he was 13 years old. He earns 77 cents a day for nine hours of work.

Among the scores of boys met and questioned in this valley of the region the following were typical and will convey an idea of the ages,

wages, and educational attainments of the boys who are under the legal age, and also the practical utility of the work certificate:

Frank Brizelle was 13 the 9th of July—

Therefore he began work at 12—

Frank Brizelle was 13 the 9th of July, and has been working for a week, having entered the breaker three months before he was 13. Although he is smaller than his age would indicate, he has never had an age certificate and affirms that he has never been asked for one.

So that violation of the law can not be put off on the guilty parents—and the parents are guilty. But under this bill the manufacturer will have to assure himself about the age. He can not excuse himself for his laches by a false certificate from the parents.

Mr. Lovejoy continues:

Michael Nicuola has been employed four months and earns \$4.93 a week. He claims to have reached 14 years the 6th of May, but several of his companions positively assert that on his recent birthday he told them he was 12.

John Barrows, who works in the same breaker, will be 14 next December. He is working on the "jigs" at present and earns \$1 a day. He has been steadily employed since he was 8 years of age.

Andrew Komovosky, who was 13 years old April 28, left school in the first grade to enter the breaker. He is absolutely illiterate.

Charley Carpenter has been working two years, although he is but 12 years old at present. His wages are 72 cents a day.

This is in the State where the law requires that they shall be 14 at the very least, and 16 in the mines.

Michael Lutonsky has also been working two years, although but 12 years old the 17th of August. He earns 66 cents for a nine-hour day and can not read his own name.

John McLaughlin \* \* \* was 14 last January and has been in the breaker five years. His wages are 65 cents for eight hours' work. He says he has had three certificates from the squire, but none from the school.

Mr. President, the rest of this article is filled with similar illustrations. The few that I have read give you a fair description of the whole.

Here is another case of a little girl, "Mary Jaeger, 3 years of age, assisting her mother. She does this eight or ten hours a day," etc.

Mr. KEAN. Where was that?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That was in Paterson, N. J. Mr. President, if the law could not be enforced against people in as humble circumstances as those, can we think it would be enforced as against the great glass mills that have great walls about them?

The affidavits which I shall publish in my remarks, with the permission of the Senate, absolutely demonstrate the violation of this law. Here is one that I will stop long enough to read:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, F. C. Roberts, who on oath says that in March, 1906, he was in High Point, N. C., representing the American Federation of Labor; that he saw there the children employed in a knee-pants factory in operation in that town; that many of them were from 10 to 12 years of age, to all appearances, and that one little girl, named Carrie Morgan, whose father was employed in one of the furniture factories of that place, was about 8 years of age, according to a statement made to him by her father; that her father furnished him with the weekly pay envelopes, showing the wages paid Carrie Morgan for the three months preceding, and that these envelopes showed that the child was paid from 19 to 49 cents per week.

F. C. ROBERTS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] WM. A. EASTERTAD,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

And, Mr. President, here [exhibiting] are the original pay envelopes for Carrie Morgan, 8 years of age, working ten and twelve hours a day.

#### "SHIPMENTS" OF CHILDREN.

There is particularly one affidavit to which I want to again call the Senate's attention, of the observation personally on a train by Mr. McKelway of a load of children being taken from Tennessee, they having been gotten by an agent from some of

the other cotton mills and shipped to other portions of the South. I should like very much to have the Senate hear it.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me this day A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in December, 1905, he was on board a train going from Knoxville, Tenn., to Spartanburg, S. C.; that he saw on board the train an immigrant agent of an immigration association of South Carolina, who was in charge of a company of about fifty people bound for the cotton mills of South Carolina, whom the agent had induced to leave their homes in western Tennessee; that the agent told him that he had made seven "shipments" of these people for the cotton mills from Newport, Tenn., averaging fifteen to the "shipment"; that seven more "shipments" had gone from Cleveland, Tenn.; that there were several agents at work besides himself, and that he had shipped personally about 500 people to the cotton mills; that he, A. J. McKelway, talked with some of the children in the company; that Harrison Swan said that he was "going on" 16 years of age and was going to work in the Four Mills, at Greenville, S. C.; that Charley Matthews and a little fellow with him of the same size said that they were about 9 years of age and were going to work in the mills; that the agent told him that there were a plenty of children 6 and 8 and 10 years of age in the South Carolina mills, because their parents lied about their ages; that in the summer of 1905 the Rev. Mr. Abernethy, a Methodist minister living at Clyde, in western North Carolina, told him, A. J. McKelway, that 1,500 people had taken the train at Clyde for the South Carolina cotton mills during the preceding year.

A. J. MCKELWAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana to print certain affidavits in the Record without reading? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If Senators are not convinced about the testimony already given that wherever even the laws exist they are not enforced, I ask them to consider the following overwhelming proof. I ask to submit the following affidavits without reading.

I repeat that if evidence above given as to the violation of the law in States that have laws does not convince the Senate, I herewith submit, which I ask to be printed in my remarks, affidavits from reputable men and women who have in person witnessed what they swear to in the various States named in the affidavits. I hope no Senator will feel that because the law is not enforced in his particular State he is called upon to make an oration in defense of his State, because State laws do not appear to be enforced anywhere.

S. Gertrude Knight, of New York City, makes the following affidavit:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York:

S. Gertrude Knight, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that the children recorded in the appended pages were seen by her working in their respective homes in the manner indicated in the course of her investigation made during November and December, 1906, their ages, hours of work, and pay as set down herewith being in accordance with the statements made by the said children or by members of their families.

S. GERTRUDE KNIGHT.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 2d day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ,

Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

Here is another affidavit from Mary Van Kleeck, of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York:

Mary Van Kleeck, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that the children recorded in the appended pages were seen by her working in their respective homes in the manner indicated in the course of her investigation made during November and December, 1906, their ages, hours of work, and pay as set down herewith being in accordance with the statements made by the said children or by members of their families.

MARY VAN KLEECK.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 2d day of January, 1907.

[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ,

Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

Children at work.	Age.	Kind of work.	Hours.	Pay.	Comments.
1. Girl .....	14	Making blue roses.....	After school....		Sister, 16, works with them. Has pulmonary tuberculosis. Father and older brother at work.
2. Girl .....	10	Putting petals together after			
3. Girl .....	8	mother has curled them.			
4. Alfred C.....	5	Separating petals for mother to	Irregular.....	13 cents per gross.....	Father at work.
5. Susie C.....	2 1/2	curl.			
6. Maria C.....	13	Preparing petals of black roses			
		for stems.	After school to	5 cents per gross.....	
			8 p. m.		
7. Josephine L.....	13	Making sprays of apple blossoms.	After school....	8 cents dozen sprays,	Father a "musician." Insufficient earnings.
8. Louisa L.....	11				
9. Rosa L.....	10				
10. Maria L.....	9	Violets .....	1 p. m. to 10 or	6 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school in afternoons. Father and three
11. Mary L.....	12				
12. Minnie P.....	14				
13. Lizzie P.....	11	Pink roses.....	After school....	8 cents per gross.....	Father dead.
14. Eva R.....	11	do.....	Afterschoolun-	2 cents per gross.....	Father a mirror maker. Drinks heavily and does not
15. May R.....	10	Putting stems on white silk fu-	til 9 or 10 p.m.		
		neral leaves.			give wages to family.



Children at work.	Age.	Kind of work.	Hours.	Pay.	Comments.
16. Mary V.....	14	Putting daisies on sprays.....	After school....	4 cents per dozen sprays.	Work in inner room. Window opens on shaft; very dark. Father idle. Two older children in factories.
17. Boy.....	9	Pasting petals on stems.....	do.....	5 to 6 cents per pair.	The mother says: "Hurry if you want to eat; no work, no eat." Father at work.
18. Boy.....	7	Finishing trousers.....	do.....	4 cents each.....	Kept out of school to work. Father idle.
19. Josephine A.....	15	do.....	5 a. m. to 10 p. m.	4 cents each.....	Has never been in school. Works in room where sister is dying of tuberculosis. Father sews a little.
20. Frances A.....	10	Finishing coats.....	do.....	4 cents each.....	Kept out of school to work. Father idle.
21. Josephine D.....	11	Finishing trousers.....	do.....	4 cents each.....	Has never been in school. Works in room where sister is dying of tuberculosis. Father sews a little.
22. Rose G.....	13	Finishing coats.....	5 a. m. to 10 p. m.	4 cents each.....	Kept out of school to work. Father idle.
23. Josie M.....	9	Finishing trousers.....	Very irregular..	3 cents per pair.....	Bastes and sews on buttons, but does no steady work. She represents the learners who work steadily as soon as they are able. Father dead.
24. Sarah M.....	10	Finishing corduroy trousers.....	Until 6 p. m.....	5 cents per pair.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
25. Philip T.....	8	Finishing trousers.....	Until 10 or 11 p. m.	3½ cents per pair.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
26. Limpia C.....	11	Pasting stems on green leaves.....	After school until 7 or 8 p. m.	2 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
27. Josephine.....	7	Hand sewing on gloves. Tapes under buttons and buttonholes.	After school.....	5 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
28. Louis B.....	9	Preparing pencil cords for card tallies.	After school until 11 or 12 p. m.	40 cents per 1,000.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
29. Mary M.....	11	Making roses and pasting them onto the stems.	1 p. m. to 8.30 p. m.	8 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
30. Jennie M.....	9	do.....	9 to 12 a. m., 3 to 8 p. m.	25 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
31. Angelina D.....	11	Making double roses.....	6 a. m. to 9 and 10 p. m.	25 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
32. Katrina D.....	8	Pasting on stems. Carrying material from front room and putting roses in boxes when finished.	1 p. m. to 9 p. m.	3½ cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
33. Angelina D.....	14	do.....	3 p. m. to 9 p. m.	10 cents per dozen.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
34. Josephine D.....	11	Turning neckties right side out after the lining has been put in.	8 a. m. to 10 p. m.	14 cents per dozen.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
35. Tony D.....	6	Sewing buttons on corset covers.	3 p. m. to 9 p. m.	3 cents each.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
36. Frank D.....	15	do.....	4 p. m. to 9.30 p. m.	50 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
37. Louise S.....	15	Making collars for coats.....	3 p. m. to 10 and 11 p. m.	50 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
38. Harry D.....	13	Putting buckles on garters.....	3 p. m. to 10 and 11 p. m.	50 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.
39. Abraham D.....	9	Putting garters on cards.....	3 p. m. to 10 and 11 p. m.	50 cents per gross.....	Kept out of school to sew. Father idle.

If the law could be violated in this instance, how much more certain is it violated in the great factories having vast influence, surrounded by walls carefully guarded, and whose owners have great control and social influence?

The same is true as to the facts stated in the following affidavit of Mary Sherman:

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
City and County of New York, N. Y.

Mary Sherman, assistant secretary of the National Consumers' League, being duly sworn, deposes and says on information and belief, that—

Rose Petrocilli, 187 Spring street, age 12 years, attends P. S. 38; works at home on men's coats from 3.30 to 9 o'clock in the evening—sometimes 9.30.

Family in the country five years.  
Father works in rag shop; makes \$9 a week.

Uncle lives with them; out of work.

Grandmother and mother work on finishing coats.

There are two other children beside the child worker in the family. The little girl Rose worked last summer every day from 8.30 to 9 at night—twelve hours—sewing on coats; she says, "I did not see the street all summer." House unlicensed.

John Burrello, 66 James street, New York City, age 11 years, attends P. S.; works at home picking nuts from 3.30 to 10 p. m. Father and brother, 18 years, both working. Grandmother, mother, and sister, 16 years, also live at home in two rooms rear tenement. The family work at home from November 15 to Christmas. House unlicensed.

MARY SHERMAN,  
Consumers' League.

Sworn to before me this 7th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] E. H. OPITZ,

Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

Again, the same is true as to the facts stated in the affidavit of Elizabeth Butler:

CASES OF CHILD LABOR IN NEW JERSEY.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., January 4, 1907.

1. On the 27th day of December, 1906, I saw Greta Shult, 15 years of age, cutting out embroidered collars. She has been doing this work for the last four years. Her mother takes this work home from an embroidery factory, and the two work together twelve hours a day in a tumble-down tenement house, cutting out the edges of the embroidery. This work is a serious strain on the health of the girl, and her general health is not nearly so good as it was formerly, according to the testimony of her mother.

2. On the 20th day of November, 1906, I saw Concetta Montignaro, 8 years of age, assisting her mother in making artificial flowers. She has been doing this for the last two years. She winds the stems of the violets and gets them ready for her mother to finish. She works usually ten hours a day. The close confinement has proven injurious to her health.

3. On the 26th day of December, 1906, I saw Nettie Schroeder, 4 years of age, making kimonos on a sewing machine. Her mother is a

contractor who deals in kimonos, and the child assists her in making the goods. For the last six months she has been able to sew all the long seams, sitting over the machine sometimes eight hours a day. (Testimony of mother as to number of hours and child's age.)

4. November 21, 1906, I visited the home of Mrs. Kane, on the first floor of a five-story tenement in Hoboken. Mrs. Kane makes the tassels for dance orders, preparing the silk in a twisted roll, and tying the pencils. Her four children—Harry, aged 4; Nellie, aged 6; Ethel, aged 8 and John, aged 10—work at untangling the silk and getting it ready for her to use. The youngest child works about nine hours a day at this, and the others spend their time when out of school helping their mother in her work. The hours when they work and the ages of the children here stated are given on the testimony of the mother and of Mrs. Itschner, a neighbor living in the same house.

5. October 24, 1906, I saw Madeline Frank, 15 years of age, making passamenterie. She has hip disease and was taken out of school at the age of 12, having been able up to that time to do very little studying. Her parents felt unable to support her without her contributing something toward her own support; and as she is incapacitated for working in a factory, for the last three years she has had to do this work at home. She receives the braid, stitches it according to the required design on a cardboard, presses it, stitches it into shape, removes it from the board, and winds it in rolls. This she does from twelve to fourteen hours a day. When I saw her she was pressing the work with heavy irons manifestly beyond her strength to lift and handle. Obviously the long hours of work and the nature of the work make it unfit for any child to attempt—much less a child physically disabled. Facts as to age and as to hours of work given on the testimony of Madeline and of her mother, Mrs. John Frank.

6. November 9, 1906, I saw Mary X. Jaeger, 3 years of age, assisting her mother, Mrs. William Jaeger, in making garters. Her mother stitches the garters one after another on the machine with one thread, and the child takes them one after another and cuts the threads between them. She does this eight to ten hours a day.

7. December 26, 1906, I saw Mamie Halleck, 12 years of age, cutting the threads of "string" embroidery. She and her mother sit at a long table with the breadth of the yard wide embroidery spread out between them, and together they go over it, cutting the threads between the different parts of the patterns, there being 400 threads often to a yard. In vacation time the girl works fourteen hours a day. In school time she works probably six hours a day, according to the testimony of her mother.

ELIZABETH B. BUTLER,

Executive Secretary Consumers' League of New Jersey.

Sworn to before me this 5th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] HENRY W. HODGES,

Notary Public No. 154, Kings County, N. Y.

Again, I remark, if the law is violated in as humble cases as those given above, where the people are without influence and where the inspectors can easily find them, how much more certain do we know that it is violated in those mighty industries whose works are carefully protected from intrusion; whose owners have widespread political, social, and financial influence; who are known to have practiced child labor in the past, and whose financial interest it is to practice child labor now.

## NONENFORCEMENT OF LAW IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Here are a number of affidavits from Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania child-labor committee, showing nonenforcement of law in Pennsylvania:

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary Pennsylvania child-labor committee, being affirmed according to law, says that on December 19, 1906, he met, at 10.45 p. m., a number of cash girls coming from the store of Lit Brothers, at Eighth and Market streets, Philadelphia.

That the girls whose pictures are attached stated their ages as 14 and said that they had started to work at 8 a. m. that morning; that they had been given one and one-half hours for dinner and supper (three-fourths hour for each).

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania child-labor committee, being affirmed according to law, says that the attached picture is of Sarah Hogan, who states her age as 13. She says that she has worked for one year, or thereabouts, at Tracy's woolen mill, Twenty-sixth and Spruce streets, Philadelphia. She has an affidavit, falsely sworn to, on which she works.

While at work in the mill she was caught and her arm broken six times in a machine. She may lose the arm, as it refuses to heal.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Committee, being affirmed according to law, says that the attached pictures were taken of Philadelphia box-factory employees during 1906.

That the pictures numbered 1 and 2 were taken during October, 1906, at 8.45 p. m.; that these girls stated that they had worked since 7 a. m. that morning; that they had half an hour for dinner, and "five minutes for supper," and that they were working Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday evening each week till 8.30 or 9 p. m.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania child-labor committee, being affirmed according to law, says that during September, 1906, he visited a tailor shop on Catharine street, Philadelphia, and found Joe Bellman, a boy of 13, according to his own statement, sewing on a coat. Said Joe Bellman stated that he had been working for a year.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary Pennsylvania Child Labor Committee, being affirmed according to law, says that on December 5, 1906, he visited Harrison, N. J., and saw Frank Monaghan, whose picture is attached.

The said boy stated his age as 12, said that he had not attended school for "a couple of years," and was engaged to wash glasses in a saloon at \$1.50 per week.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Committee, being affirmed according to law, says that he has spent some time investigating conditions in the soft-coal mines at Morris Run, Tioga County, Pa.

That he has questioned two boys—one working in the mines, and the other coming from work in the mines—who stated their ages as 11.

That it is a common thing to have boys of 17 or 18 state that they started to work at 11, and in some cases at 9 and 10.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Committee, being duly affirmed according to law, says that during July, 1906, he visited Pittsburg, Pa., and on the "Hill" saw Joe London, whose photograph is attached, who was working in a cellar on Webster street, stripping tobacco. He said he was 13.

That he saw Rosie and Goldie Berkowitz, the older girl, Rosie, stating her age as 13, who were working in a garret at manufacturing "stogies."

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

## STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Scott Nearing, secretary of the Pennsylvania child labor committee, being affirmed according to law, says that during April, 1906, he spent several days in the neighborhood of Scranton, Pa.

That at Dunmore he saw a boy, Tony Ignoso, who stated his age as "13 at Saturday," and who had worked, according to his statement, the previous summer in the Bliss silk mill at Dunmore.

That the girls sat on the window sills in said mill at Dunmore and ate lunch while the machinery kept on running, and that the "dressing room" provided according to law consisted of hooks between the windows.

That the Bliss mill at Priceburg runs night and day, and that on the night shift, in a group of five boys, two stated their age as 16, although they were brothers and not twins.

That in the same mill a girl worked on the day shift whose photograph is numbered 1 on the attached list. That she stated her age as 14, and had been working for three and one-half years in said mill. Her age when she started, she said, was 13.

SCOTT NEARING.  
[SEAL.] HENRY J. REBMAN, Notary Public.

(Commission expires March 13, 1909.)

Here is an affidavit as to facts ascertained by a lady whose word no man or woman in her State can question, even if she did not make an affidavit, as she does, to what she saw, and this is in the State of Illinois, which has one of the very best laws in the Union and an admirable inspection. I present the affidavit of Harriet M. Van Der Vaart:

## STATE OF ILLINOIS, County of Cook, ss:

In the winter of 1905, for the National Child Labor Committee, I visited a number of glass factories in Indiana and Illinois. In glass factories workers alternate between day and night work. The day shift of one or two weeks will be the night shift of the following one or two weeks. Boys generally prefer night work. They can cut short the sleeping time in the day and have several hours for play. The night shift is dismissed generally at 3.30 in the morning. Coming from the intense heat around the furnaces into the cool morning air makes the workers liable to colds and pulmonary troubles. The gas, the changes in temperature, and violent exercise, such as the constant rapid walking between the furnaces and the annealing ovens, are debilitating and tend to retard growth and development. Boys who work in glass factories as a rule are shorter, weigh less, and in every way are not as well developed as boys living a more normal life.

The boy's work in a glass factory does not require any training or skill. The apprenticeship to the glass blowers is very long—five years—and very few boys ever become apprentices. As boys are at a premium in the glass industry, they can work a day, half a day, a night, or half the night, and it is optional with the boy whether he returns or not. In some factories it is customary to give them extra pay if they will stay the entire week and do good work. Numbers of idle boys loaf around many of the factories, work some, carry beer very often, and, as a business man told me who has a store near the large glass factory in Streator, some gamble and use language that makes the vicinity avoided.

In Indiana I found it customary for the school children to go into the factory at 6 in the evening and work until between 11 and 12, especially Thursday and Friday nights, and to work all day Saturday. I found children of 11 and 12 working at night in both States. Saloons abound in the vicinity of glass factories. In some factories beer is forbidden within the yard; in others it is not, and boys are sent after the beer by the workmen. In all the warmth and light of the saloon is the first temptation that presents itself to the boy as he leaves the factory, debilitated and relaxed, at 3.30 in a cold winter's morning.

Manufacturers have a great deal of difficulty in getting boys. Intelligent parents are learning that glass factories are demoralizing for boys. As a rule, it is the children of our foreign population and of ignorant parents who wish their children to work in glass factories. When I visited Alton in 1905 in going through the factory we did not find any violations of the child-labor law, but in visiting the homes of children who worked in the factory I was told over and over that the factory had been prepared for the visit and that all the children had been sent home the night before because they had been told the factory inspectors were coming. When I returned to the factory and told the proprietors what I had learned in the children's homes, Mr. Smith, the head of the factory, said: "But, madam, what would you do if you were a proprietor and learned the enemy was in the field; wouldn't you try to protect yourself?"

In December of this year, 1906, I visited Alton again, and, although refused admittance into the factory, I visited a number of the homes of children who worked in the factory, and over and over again found that the children were working in violation of the child-labor law of Illinois.

I was told that the factory had been inspected the week before, and the proprietors fined for violating the law. From my experience I should say that glass manufacturers are not obeying the child-labor laws we now have and are teaching children to disregard the law. The excuse given is because of the competition in the different States. Those with whom I have talked say there would not be any objection to stringent laws if the same laws applied to all factories in the United States.

HARRIET M. VAN DER VAART,  
Chicago, Ill.  
[SEAL.] IVA G. WOODEN, Notary Public.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of January, A. D.

1907.

(My commission expires February 23, 1909.)

Here is another, from Elizabeth B. Butler, of New Jersey:

JANUARY 4, 1907.

December 27, 1906, I visited Mrs. Breidenkopf, in West Hoboken, N. J. She is an artificial flower maker, and her chief assistant for the last two years was her daughter Felicie, who died two months ago, at the age of 5 years. The child was as skillful a flower maker as her mother, and her mother states that in twisting the stems of violets and of small roses the child was the quicker of the two. She also, at the times of year when the flower work was slack, cut the yard embroidery, cutting sometimes 50 yards an hour. She worked from 6



o'clock in the morning until 11 at night daily. Her mother states that she had no disease, and died suddenly from no assignable cause.

ELIZABETH B. BUTLER,  
Executive Secretary, Consumers' League of New Jersey.

Sworn to before me this 5th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

HENRY W. HODGES,  
Notary Public No. 154, Kings County, N. Y.

Here are three affidavits from Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, extracts of whose sparkling articles in the Outlook and Woman's Home Companion have already been given. All these deal with violations in Pennsylvania and almost at the present time:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York:

Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that on May 8, 1906, in Nanticoke, Pa., he met Peter Swanbery, whose photograph is attached hereto. That said boy stated that he began working in a coal breaker during vacations at 12 years of age; that for two years he had worked continuously until March 2, 1906; that he was 16 on December 25, 1905; that March 2, 1906, his arm was caught in the machinery of the "scraper line" and torn out at the shoulder; that after his injury the machinery in the breaker was properly guarded, and that he received no damages from the company, but was treated at the hospital in Wilkes-Barre without expense.

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.  
Sworn and subscribed to before me this 7th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ,  
Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York:

Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that on May 14, 1906, in Banian, Clearfield County, Pa., he met Robert Richardson, a boy apparently 12 years of age and said by Miss Nellie Stoddard, public school-teacher, to be 12 years of age. Richardson said he went to work in the mines driving a mule in the fall of 1905, 11 years, and was hurt in November. That he was run over by a car and his leg broken in two places. That he spent five weeks in the hospital in Phillipsburg, but received no compensation from the mining company because of his injuries. That his mother asserts that he is 15 years old, and he proposes to return to the mine as soon as able.

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.  
Sworn and subscribed to before me this January 9, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ,  
Notary Public for the City and County of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York:

Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, of said city and county, being duly sworn, deposes and says that on October 26, 1906, Joseph Shafer, superintendent of schools in Springdale, near Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, Pa., stated to him that Sam Madill, of Springdale, who had worked in a bituminous coal mine from about the age of 13, had been run over in the mine by a coal car two years ago and his foot taken off and that since then he had attended school and is now employed in a post-office.

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.  
Sworn and subscribed to before me this 7th day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

E. H. OPITZ,  
Notary Public for the City and County of New York.  
NONENFORCEMENT OF LAW IN THE SOUTH.

Here are some from the Southern States. They are mostly by Dr. A. J. McKelway, one of the purest, bravest, and ablest men in the South, who has given his life to this great work, as Lord Shaftesbury gave his to the same work in England. Doctor McKelway is now connected with the National Child Labor Committee and is the man to whom I have already referred.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in December, 1905, he visited the silk mills at Alexandria, Va., known as the "Clots Throwing Company." That he saw a large number of boys and girls under 14 coming out of the mill at the noon hour and returning to it. That he secured photographs of some of these children. That at least ten of them seemed to be under 12 years of age, thus being employed in violation of the Virginia law.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in August, 1906, he visited the Asheville cotton mills, at Asheville, N. C. That he saw a number of children who appeared to be under 12, the legal age for employing children in North Carolina. That some of these children told him they were under 12, and that he took photographs of some of these children employed in the Asheville cotton mills who to all appearance were under 12 years of age.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me this 22d day of January, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in January, 1905, he visited a cottage rented by employees of a cotton mill at Raleigh, N. C. That he saw there a child of 12 years of age who testified, and whose testimony his mother confirmed, that he had been working in the mill since he was 6 years old.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in January, 1905, in company with a Baptist minister of Raleigh, he visited the Pilot Cotton Mills, of Raleigh, and saw several children evidently under the age of 12 years coming from the mill at the lunch hour; that the father of one of these children said that he was 10 years of age, this being a violation of the North Carolina law.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who, on oath, says in the fall of 1904, after the North Carolina child-labor law had gone into effect, he took an unofficial school census of the Atherton Mills village. That out of a hundred persons of school age fifty-nine were working in the mill, eight were going to school, and that thirteen children under 14 were working in the mill and four under twelve were working in the mill. That James Eli Griffith was born January 28, 1894, and was therefore not 11 years old at the time, according to the family Bible. That he was suffering at the time from a bad knife wound on his leg, an accident while he was making bands in the mill. That Eugene Broughton was 12 years old on February 4 following, his employment also being a violation of the law. That Minnie Griffith, aged 12, had been a spinner in the mill, but, according to her mother's testimony, grew too weak and sick to remain in the mill.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

This day personally before me, a notary public, came A. J. McKelway, who on oath doth say that on the 10th day of January, 1907, he visited the Belmont graded schools near Charlotte, N. C. That he found in each grade of the school except the primary grade boys and girls who had already worked in cotton mills. That in the third grade there were thirteen children who gave their names and ages and the mills in which they worked as follows:

Oscar Hargate, age 9, Old Mill, Rock Hill, S. C.; Frank Hearn, age 9, Statesville; Bertram Holmes, age 9, Louise mills; Jeb. Wallace, age 13, gingham mills; Clara Davis, age 8, Louise mills; Ernest Broadnax, age 7, Victor mills; Callie Hargett, age 11, Louise mills; Lilley James, age 10, gingham mills; Percy Brook, age 13, Louise mills; Myrtle Beam, age 13, Louise mills; Arthur Johnson, age 16, Louise mills; Grade Rion, age 12, gingham mills; Carl Davis, age 9, Calvin mills.

That four of these children claimed to have helped mothers or sister in the mills. That the principal of the school declared that it was a matter of constant complaint that the children, often those under 12, which is the legal age in North Carolina, left the school to work in the mills. That the school enrollment was only about one-half of the school census of the district, taken the previous year, and that the school attendance was much below the enrollment, largely because of this competition between the school and the mill.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

STATE OF GEORGIA, County of Fulton:

This is to certify that the attached picture contains the likeness of three of my children. They are named, respectively, Liiza Smith, 8 years old, who has been working in the Exposition mills about two weeks; Ida Smith, 10 years old, who has been working in the Exposition mills about four months and in other Georgia mills about two years. Altogether she has worked about four years in cotton mills; Nora Smith, 13 years old, who has been working in the Exposition mills about four months and in other Georgia mills about two years. Altogether she has worked in cotton mills about five years. I myself work for the Exposition Cotton Mills Company, and have one other child working in said mill. This June 26, 1905.

A. M. SMITH.

Witness:  
D. A. TEDDER.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that he has in his possession the photograph referred to in the above affidavit, that he had also in his possession the original affidavit of which the above is a true copy, and that the affidavit was published in the Atlanta Journal July 3, 1905.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in the month of May or June, 1906, he visited a school taught in the village of the Milstead Manufacturing Company of Conyers, Ga.; that the school is mainly supported by the generosity of this company; that the enrollment for the year had been about ninety, and that the average age of those attending was 9 years, according to the testimony of the teachers in charge; that the attendance at the time of the visit was about thirty; that the teachers gave the names of twenty-two children who had left the school for the mill during the school term, and of these two were 12 years of age, four were 11, three were 10, two were 9, five were 8, and one was 7; that of the thirty children then in school eight declared that they had worked in the mill; and that he took a photograph of these children, and that the smallest does not seem to be more than 6 years old.

A. J. MCKELWAY.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.]

EDGAR L. CORNELIUS, Notary Public, District of Columbia.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that in the summer of 1906 he visited a family employed then at the Whittier mills, near Atlanta, Ga. That he saw the mother, who had been left a widow while employed by the Milstead Manufacturing Company the year before, and that she had declared that she had taken her children as follows to work with her in the mill: Pearl, aged 16; Jeffie, 14; Clifford, 9; Loy, 7; leaving Louis, a child of 4 in charge of a baby, Aline, aged 2. That the management of the Milstead Manufacturing Company, Clifford West, then aged 9 years, was playing given, except that the name of Loy, aged 7, did not appear on the pay roll and that he only helped his mother. That according to the testimony of both Mrs. West and the management of the Milstead Manufacturing Company, Clifford West, then aged 9 years, was playing about an elevator and was quite badly hurt by a weight striking his head and then by being pinned to the floor by the opening of the elevator doors. That according to Mrs. West's statement she moved with these children from the Milstead Manufacturing Company to the Whittier mills in order to get the higher wages paid for night work. That at the time of this interview with Mrs. West, Clifford West, then aged 11, was working in the Whittier mills at night, the rest of the family having changed to day work. That the hours of labor in Georgia for operatives of all ages is *sixty-six hours a week*, which, by reason of the half holiday on Saturday amounts to *twelve hours a day or twelve hours a night* for the first five working days of the week.

A. J. MCKELWAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] EDGAR L. CORNELIUS,  
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public, A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that he has visited a number of mills in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama in the last two years, some of which were known as model mills, and that he has never seen any mill in these States in which there was not a large number of children employed under 14, many under 12, and not a few under 10; that it is a matter of common knowledge in these States that the laws against the employment of children are not enforced; that there is no factory inspection nor any provision made by the States for the enforcement of the law; that he has never learned of any prosecution in any of these States for violations of the law; that in North Carolina alone, according to the report of the commissioner of labor for 1905, *sixty-six mills run at night as well as during the day*; that there are frequent accidents in the mills, children of tender years being injured by the machinery of the mills; that the children who have to breathe the atmosphere containing the flying lint of the spinning rooms suffer with throat and lung troubles and with diseases of the eyes from the same cause—the lint in the air; that according to the testimony of physicians the critical period in the life of young girls comes in the climate of these States between the ages of 12 and 16, and that the long continued labor of the mills at this period is often an injury to young girls for life; that the hours of labor allowed by law for children of 10 and 12 years in these States are *sixty-six hours a week*, and that in one of these States—South Carolina—children of any age may be employed in the mills by day if the children of dependent parents.

A. J. MCKELWAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] EDGAR L. CORNELIUS,  
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

## STATE OF GEORGIA, County of Fulton:

This day personally before me, a notary public, came J. I. Williams and U. I. Davis, who, on oath, each for himself doth say that they know Ida Owens, the largest of the little girls in the annexed picture, and that she works in the mill called the "Gate City Mill," and that she has the reputation of being 8 years old; and that they also know the four boys in the annexed picture, namely, Charley Hart, who is the largest in the picture, and has the reputation of being 10 years old; Willie Collins, the next largest, who has the reputation of being 11 years old; Ernest Driver, who has the reputation of being 10 years old; and Grady Humphries, who has the reputation of being 10 years old; and that these all work in the Gate City Cotton Mills, and that none of them are fatherless or motherless children, and that none of them are going to school, and that to the best of their knowledge and belief some of them are unable to read or write. And that they know Homer Hembree, Virgil McElroy, Ben Smith, Carlton Smith, Fasse Smith, Will Hart, Harry Hogan, Fred Hogan, Robert Gaston; and that these all work in the Gate City Cotton Mills.

J. I. WILLIAMS.

U. I. DAVIS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this June 9, 1905.

D. M. MATHEWS,  
Notary Public, Fulton County.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

Personally before me, a notary public, appeared A. J. McKelway, who on oath says that he witnessed the signing of the above affidavit and had in his possession the original of which this is a true copy, and that he saw Ola Owens and took her photograph, and that she said she was 8 years old; that he took the photograph of the four boys—Charley Hart, Ernest Driver, Willie Collins, and Grady Humphreys—and that they gave their ages as they are given in the above affidavit, and that the other children and their relatives and friends testified to the ages of these children as follows: That Homer Hembree was said to be 7 years old and had been working in the mill about a year; that Fasse Smith was 12 years old and had been working in the mill four years; that Will Hart was 7 or 8 years old and had been working in the mill over a week; that Fred Hogan was 8 years old and had been working in the mill when he was not sick, and that Robert Gaston was 11 years old and had been working in the mill nearly two years.

A. J. MCKELWAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of January, 1907.  
[SEAL.] EDGAR L. CORNELIUS,  
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

## RESISTANCE TO ENACTMENT OF STATE LEGISLATION.

Not only is there universal nonenforcement of law, but there has been and still is resistance to good legislation. It is noto-

rious that wherever friends of this reform have attempted to secure legislation the interests which were profiting by the evil resisted their efforts or else defeated or impaired such laws as were passed. For example, Mr. Durland, from whom I have already extensively quoted, tells the following action of the glass manufacturers in Pennsylvania in Outlook, volume 74, on page 125:

## RESISTANCE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Yet the indifference of legislators or the lack of public pressure has resulted in a continuance of the system, with never a strong hand raised in protest. As soon as the Western Association of Glass Manufacturers saw that a bill had been introduced to abolish night work, a committee was appointed to go to Harrisburg and prevent the enactment of any legislation this session. These manufacturers are reported to have adopted resolutions denouncing and ridiculing that section of the bill which provided that children must learn to read and write English before beginning to work. It was the influence of this organization that helped to keep in office as chief factory inspector for several years Mr. James Campbell. Mr. Campbell it was who had been an advocate of the glass manufacturers at all hearings on the glass tariff before the Committee on Ways and Means at Washington. Mr. Campbell it was who, in speaking in Pittsburgh last October, before the Mothers' Congress, said that Pennsylvania suffers from the excessive education of workmen's children. This is the theory that some of Mr. Campbell's subordinates have been fond of upholding of late. As recently as March, at a meeting of the Civic Club in Philadelphia, a late factory inspector urged the same point. But Mr. Campbell has been removed by Governor Pennypacker, and his successor promises a more enlightened policy. These are the kind of men who do not even pretend to enforce existing laws. As Judge Gray further remarks, "Some of the laws in the anthracite region are little better than dead letters." Endless excuses are advanced for this laxity, but there is little validity in any of them.

Mrs. Kelley tells of resistance to the passage of legislation in one or two States in her book entitled "Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation." On pages 53 and 54 she says:

## RESISTANCE IN ILLINOIS.

Although the manufacture of glass is one of the industries most highly protected by the tariff for many years past and although the wages of glass blowers are protected by a most influential and all-embracing union, yet employers and glass blowers have in at least two States worked together to keep the children from receiving any adequate legislative protection. In Illinois for ten years the glass manufacturers were successful in their unwearying efforts to prevent the enactment of a provision restricting night work to persons over the age of 16 years. And even when the present enlightened measure was finally passed, in 1903, this was done against the protest of the manufacturers and of a glass-bottle blower who appeared before the senate committee at Springfield in opposition to the bill. In New Jersey, in 1904, there was the same conflict, the glass-bottle blowers' union, as such, urging the passage of a law prohibiting night work for children and the glass manufacturers nevertheless securing for the opposition the support of a State senator at Trenton who had once been a blower and who succeeded in getting stricken out of the bill this most valuable of its provisions, despite the united efforts of the labor organizations of the whole State and of the Children's Protective Alliance, comprising forty societies for the protection and welfare of children.

In Pennsylvania, in March, 1903, the Western Pennsylvania Association of Glass Manufacturers voted at a public meeting held in Pittsburgh to keep a committee at Harrisburg throughout the session of the legislature to prevent the enactment of a measure prohibiting night work for children and all employment of illiterate children. So successful was this committee that the friends of the bill were not even granted a hearing before the senate committee to which the bill was referred. In all these cases the arguments used were identical. Poverty must not be intensified by prohibiting the employment even of the youngest and most illiterate children.

Fortunately the friends of the working children have at last succeeded in bringing to light the hypocrisy of this plea. It has been shown that for a series of years the glass manufacturers of New Jersey and Ohio have imported children from other States. Charitable institutions and child-placing agencies have been appealed to to furnish detached boys and have done so in more than one case. Children have been sent from one State to another to meet the demand.

Miss Ashby, in the World's Work, volume 2, page 1293, says in her article on "Child Labor in Southern Cotton Mills" concerning resistance to legislation:

## RESISTANCE IN ALABAMA.

The strongest objection to preventive legislation is, of course, the desire for cheap labor. To the shame of the northern capitalist be it said, he has carefully fostered this superstition in order to obtain the cheap and submissive labor that he believes children give. In 1887 a law was passed in Alabama limiting the hours of children's work in factories to eight a day.

At the instigation of Massachusetts mill owners this law was repealed in December, 1894, on their promise that these mill owners would establish a factory in Alabama. To-day the mills thus established are working at least fifty children under 12 years old for eleven and three-quarters hours a day. It is difficult to see the exact benefit to Alabama, since all the capital in the Alabama City Mills is northern and eastern and the dividends go out of the State.

The village is a beautiful one, managed with much moral and sanitary severity, but no seeming philanthropies, such as natatoriums, churches, the libraries (for people who can not even read), can atone for this deliberate demoralization of the southern conscience and injury to the future of her industries by those who in their own State are forbidden to work children by the best factory laws in the world. In Massachusetts no child may go into the mills under 14, and only then after having attended school for at least a year.

This is not an isolated instance. Much of the opposition to the passage of a protective law to the southern legislatures is made by the representatives of northern corporations, who are taking full advantage of the possibility of child labor. In eleven mills I visited owned by northern capital there were twice as many children under 12 as in thirteen owned by southern capital.

The total number of children under 12 in the mills of Alabama (including the unpaid "helpers") I computed to be about 1,200. This



number is not stationary or diminishing; on the contrary, it is steadily increasing, and the experience of the other Southern States proves that it must be so. In one of the older mills they told me that the children were younger and more numerous than they had ever had them before.

Again she says on page 1294:

In Augusta, Ga., a count was made in June, 1900, through 8 mills, and 556 children under 12 were found working. In South Carolina Mr. John B. Cleveland, president of the Whitney mills, giving evidence before the legislature, stated that 30 per cent of the operatives in the Whitney mills were under 12, and Mr. James L. Orr, president of the Piedmont mills, South Carolina, that 25 per cent of his machinery was run by such children. The statement sometimes made, that the number of children affected is so small that it is not worth public attention, is not borne out by these figures, nor by the fact that in Georgia as many as 30 mill presidents appeared before the legislature to defeat the child-labor bill there.

Again, on page 1295, she says:

Northern and southern capitalists should be warned by their work people in the North and their fellow-citizens to withdraw their opposition to the passage of such a law.

The opposition at present is immense. When I returned from my tour of investigation in Alabama I found the whole community, except those directly interested financially in cotton mills, on my side. The press, the pulpit, the schools, the women in their various clubs took the matter up. A bill was presented at the second session of the Alabama legislature, in the upper and lower houses, by gentlemen who had no connection with the labor movement.

The mill owners immediately engaged two able lawyers, who were also professional lobbyists, to deal with the members of the legislature on the subject. Representatives were warned that the local bills they had been sent up to pass would have small prospect of success should they vote for a child-labor law.

At a hearing before the joint committees of the house and senate the senate chamber was packed to overflowing. The mill owners' interests were represented by a lawyer who was also the president of a cotton mill, the owners of which are "philanthropic" northern people—a corporation clergyman and a railway attorney.

None of these men ever touched on the pros and cons of child labor. The sincerity of their arguments may be gauged by their bringing forward a miserable little petition against the bill, written on the official paper of a very small mill, and signed by seventeen of its operatives.

The hearing was simply a public bluff. It appears that the rejection of the bill had been settled before in spite of public excitement upon the question. Similar defeats were recently experienced in Georgia and South Carolina, where the educated women have been making gallant efforts to get the need for child-labor legislation recognized.

#### THE FIGHT IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Here is what Doctor Roberts says in Outlook, volume 78, September-December, 1904, pages 982-984:

No child under 13 years of age can, according to law, be regularly employed, but in every industrial center where children are to any extent employed the consensus of opinion among labor leaders and professional men is that the law is evaded. A labor leader in Lancaster said: "I'll swear by a stack of Bibles as high as the Lutheran Church that there are scores of children under 13 years of age in these factories." In Allentown child labor is at a premium, while men walk the streets unable to get work. A silk manufacturer of this city said: "All silk-throwing plants ought to get out of Allentown, for child labor is too scarce." In Reading a hosiery manufacturer said: "We can not get all the boys and girls we need in our factories." Employers when asked, "Do parents try to secure employment to children under age?" invariably answered, "Yes." Superintendents of public schools in centers of textile industries are uniform in their testimony that a certain percentage of parents take their children from school when they are only 10, 11, or 12 years of age and send them to the factory or mill. Physicians who practice among employees in mills and factories are unanimous in their testimony that children are employed before they are 13 years of age. Lawyer Craig, of Lebanon, said: "Stop ignorant and greedy parents from committing perjury when they take out certificates of employment to their children." Doctor Davies, of Lancaster, said: "Execute the laws now in force before you attempt to pass others."

Is this expression of public sentiment justified? In every industrial center there are humane and patriotic employers, but they must compete with sinister and heartless men who regard all consideration for tender children seeking employment as "sentiment," which has no place in business relations. In every large city there are factories of ill repute, wherein conditions are wretched, wages low, and the moral atmosphere degrading. I visited one of these where 600 employees labored, 65 per cent of whom were under 16 years of age. Six months ago a strike had occurred in this factory. I asked a boy 17 years old if they had won it. His reply was, "No; the kids defeated us." Among these employees it would be easy to select a score or two of boys and girls under 13 years. The deputy factory inspector has sent home as many as thirty employees from this mill in one day, but within a week most of them were back again. The two wards from which the employer draws his labor supply are the most congested in the city, and one of them is being rapidly filled by an influx of Slaves and Italians. A public school superintendent, who has taught in these two wards for fifteen years, said: "It is an impossibility to stop the exodus of boys and girls to the mills before they are 13 years of age." He had conducted night schools for many years in these wards, and 50 per cent of the boys attending them were doing primary work. In the town of Freeland I met three sisters coming home from the silk mill; each of them began work when she was 12 years of age. The superintendent of public schools in this borough said: "Boys and girls leave my schools in large numbers from 10 to 12 years of age. Some leave before they are 10 years." In my visit through silk and hosiery mills, rope and school-slate factories, cigar and candy establishments, I saw anemic children under the legal age, with frail constitutions, working sixty hours a week. Some of these were stunted and deformed, whom competent physicians would send to hospitals rather than have them work ten hours a day in a vitiated atmosphere for 3 cents an hour.

Do not factory inspectors know this? Yes; but their hands are tied by political influence. When Gus Egolf, of Norristown, was appointed deputy factory inspector last June, he turned out in one week 200 children illegally employed in his district. In one borough of 8,000 population he sent home 50 children from factories. When Deputy

Factory Inspector Betchel was appointed last June, over 500 children illegally employed were found in Berks County alone. In one borough he sent home 45 children from 9 to 12 years who were employed contrary to law. He prosecuted the mayor of the city of Reading for illegally giving two boys certificates of employment. The mayor paid a fine of \$31. He also successfully prosecuted an alderman for the same offense in the same city. In another city the factory inspector tried to prosecute an alderman who issued certificates of employment to children not legally qualified to work. He did not succeed, for the reason that no justice of the peace would try a "brother officer." One factory inspector candidly admitted that he could not discharge his duties in the town in which he resided. If he did, he would commit political suicide within six months. Another factory inspector successfully prosecuted an influential employer. The suit cost the employer \$400 and the inspector his office. The Central Labor Union of Lancaster prosecuted the leading factory in the city for employing children contrary to law. The case has never been tried, and the officers of the union can not find out the reason why. Sometimes factory inspectors "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." A poor organ grinder in one of our cities was fined \$25 and costs for employing a boy not 13 years of age to help him. In the same city a factory wherein 900 persons labor has from 50 to 60 children employed contrary to law, but this transgressor has not been prosecuted. Another storekeeper was prosecuted for employing a girl under 13 years of age, and in the same city scores of girls are employed under that age, and nothing is done about it. The heads of large factories are invariably a power in the politics of the town or city wherein they reside, and the factory inspectors are appointees of the "machine."

Some employers transgress the factory laws of the State in working children under 16 years of age and adult females more than sixty hours a week. The chief transgressors in this respect are the silk and hosiery mills, the cigar, school slates, box, and umbrella factories. These industries have their busy seasons, during which the employees work overtime. In one factory little girls were kept working from 1 o'clock till 8 without respite—a continuous stretch of seven hours. Sometimes one department in a large factory falls behind the others, and the employer offers a premium to the employees to "catch up." Under this pressure I saw boys under 15 years of age working fourteen hours a day. The mother of three young girls who worked overtime said: "It's from bed to work and from work to bed." These children got up at 6 o'clock in the morning and worked till 8 o'clock in the evening. When questioned about the time they had for the noonday meal and how they used it, one of the girls said: "I take a nap, when I can, on the bales."

Spargo says this on violation of law, on page 168:

In the canning and preservation of fish, fruit, and vegetables mere babies are employed during the busy season. In more than one canning factory in New York State I have seen children of 6 and 7 years of age working at 2 o'clock in the morning. In Oneida Mr. William English Walling, formerly a factory inspector of Illinois, found one child 4 years old who earned 19 cents in an afternoon stringing beans, and other children from 7 to 10 years of age. There are over 500 canning factories in New York State, but the census of 1900 gives the number of children employed under 16 years of age as 219. This is merely another illustration of the deceptiveness of the statistics which are gathered at so much expense. The agent of the New York Child Labor Committee was told by the foreman of one factory that there were 300 children under 14 years of age in that one factory! In Syracuse it was a matter of complaint in the season of 1904 on the part of the children that "the factories will not take you unless you are 8 years old."

In Maryland there are absolutely no restrictions placed upon the employment of children in canneries. They may be employed at any age, by day or night, for as many hours as the employers choose or the children can stand and keep awake. In Oxford, Md., I saw a tiny girl, 7 years old, who had worked for twelve hours in an oyster-canning factory, and I was told that such cases were common. There were 290 canning establishments in the State of Maryland in 1900, all of them employing young children absolutely without legal restriction. And I fear that it must be added with little or no moral restriction either. Where regard for child life does not express itself in humane laws for its preservation, it may generally be presumed to be non-existent.

In Maine the age limit for employment is 12 years. Children of that age may be employed by day or night, provided that girls under 18 and boys under 16 are not permitted to work more than ten hours in the twenty-four or sixty hours in a week. In 1900 there were 117 establishments engaged in the preservation and canning of fish. Small herrings are canned and placed upon the market as "sardines." This industry is principally confined to the Atlantic coast towns—Lubec and Eastport, in Washington County, being the main centers. I can not speak of this industry from personal investigation, but information received from competent and trustworthy sources gives me the impression that child slavery nowhere assumes a worse form than in the "sardine" canneries of Maine. Says one of my correspondents in a private letter: "In the rush season fathers, mothers, older children, and babies work from early morn till night—from dawn till dark, in fact. You will scarcely believe me, perhaps, when I say and babies, but it is literally true. I've seen them in the present season no more than 4 or 5 years old working hard and beaten when they lagged. As you may suppose, being out here, far away from the center of the State, we are not much troubled by factory inspection. I have read about the conditions in the southern mills, but nothing I have read equals for sheer brutality what I see right here in Washington County."

At the last session of the legislature of North Carolina a determined effort was made to perfect the absurdly inadequate law of that State. This was led by Dr. A. J. McKelway, whose affidavits you have heard, and who is a resident and one of the most esteemed citizens of that Commonwealth. The manufacturers had resisted all previous attempts to get a good law, which resistance resulted in the present inefficient statute.

The effort to make the law general and provide for compulsory education was as bitterly resisted by the mill owners at the last session of the North Carolina legislature as similar interests resisted compulsory education and good law in West Virginia.

I here insert some of the statements made by these mill owners, without giving their names, for I do not want to sub-

ject them to public condemnation unless they compel it. I read, however, from the stenographer's notes of the hearing before the legislative committee. One of them said:

In the first place the employees themselves can not do without the wages they earn in the mills; in the next place, the mills of North Carolina can not do without the help. That is all there is to it. You may go into any mill, I do not care where it is, and you will find the proprietors doing all they can to help the cause of education.

I will tell you how it was last year with the mill people. Why, the farmers took the children and put them to work on their farms picking cotton. The law has nothing to do with picking cotton.

I want to say that England is still reaching out for more cotton. She is building more cotton mills. She is mistress of the sea. She has got more consumers than any Nation on earth; and yet she is doing everything she can to get more of these people in the cotton mills, and they are going there—building more mills every year.

If it has had such a terrible effect in reducing the stature of the men so that the army could not be recruited, what I would like to know is why are they building more cotton mills and why are they going to all parts of the globe and doing everything to get the cotton into England? It seems to me there is no common sense in that argument.

Another mill owner said:

I do not think that the legislature of North Carolina ought ever to undertake any class legislation. As a principle, I believe it is wrong. However, we see the recurrence of this trouble in two years, and we will have it every two years hereafter, as we have it up North.

We find out who will go to school, and we get in extra help and turn out the little fellows who will go to school and send them to school. This is the best we can do, and all we can do. But we do not want laws that force some of our people, and will make them move back to their farms because they can not get support at the mill.

Enact this law, and it results that a great number of my people can not make a living at the mill and will have to go back to their farms or get out of the range of the law by moving to South Carolina where they are not tampered with.

Our conditions can not be compared with the Eastern States. We down here use more small labor, more cheap labor than they can use in the Eastern States, for the simple reason that we are spinners of yarn down here, largely, and those people up there are consumers of yarn. We spin—the boys and the girls spin the yarn and the women and the men run the looms and the knitting machines. That is the difference.

Another mill owner said:

Of course the edict of the Almighty is "By the sweat of thy brow thou shalt get thy bread." That is that the large majority of the people shall always be simply working people, that a man who has nothing whatever but his right hand to work for him and for his wife and children has a very hard time in this world.

The sentiment that gives so much force to the idea which Doctor McKelway represents comes from the class that sleeps late in the morning—professors, teachers, and ladies who have time to cultivate their kindness of heart, and they get in the habit of sleeping late in the morning, and they get in the habit of thinking that a man who has to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning is a very much downtrodden person.

Of course, this mill owner is right—it is a fine thing for a child to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and work twelve hours, standing all the time.

Another mill owner said:

It will ruin the mill interests of North Carolina. I say again, gentlemen, from a Democratic standpoint, it is wisdom for you gentlemen to let the bill stand as it is.

It was "wisdom" from a Democratic standpoint "to let the law stand," said this mill owner at this hearing of the North Carolina legislature, and they were "wise"—they let it stand.

Another mill owner said:

And it was a distinct understanding that if the compromise were made, we would not be brought here for years and years to come. It was well known upon that occasion, gentlemen, and it was argued upon that occasion, that it was unnecessary to enact laws, to make laws, binding upon the textile mills of North Carolina.

I say to you, gentlemen, that the mill industry of North Carolina represents the "best people" of North Carolina.

"Best people" again, you see; only this time they are not in Georgia but in North Carolina.

I say to you, gentlemen, that there is no doubt as to their intention to help. I say to you, gentlemen, that it was *unwise two years ago to have enacted any legislation at all*. But we bowed our heads in humble submission to your will, with the distinct understanding that we were to have no further legislation upon this point.

You see this mill owner didn't want any legislation at all, and he actually "submitted" to the law upon the "understanding" that no more laws would ever be passed.

This same mill owner goes on:

Now, gentlemen, I have investigated this matter and I say that if the McKelway bill is passed that it will clog the wheels of industry in North Carolina for ever and ever. I say, gentlemen, that you must come down to this in a practical, common-sense way and investigate what effect it would have on the mills of North Carolina not to allow children of 13 to work in the mills; estimate what it would have not to allow children of 16 years of age to work at night. I say to you when you take that little boy out of the mill, take the little spinner out of the mill, you might as well sweep that mill out of existence.

And I say to you, furthermore, that it is not hardly possible that South Carolina will crowd out her mills. And what will the people at Rockingham, Charlotte, and those other towns that are near to McCall and Columbia—what will these mills do? Their help will leave our mills and flock to this other State where they can find employment for their children.

That's the heart of the whole trouble with the States stopping this infamy. If one does and another don't, the mill owners of the latter get the children of the former.

But I ask you for God's sake—

Think of that appeal—

I ask you for the sake of these little children whom He is supposed to represent; I ask you for the sake of the men who have their money interested in this business; I ask you for the sake of the future interests in your grand old State of North Carolina to sit down on every bill they ever propose to you, and let these mill men go to their respective homes with the feeling that they will not every two years have the sword of Damocles over their necks.

Well, the North Carolina legislature could not resist such an appeal as that, of course. Who could?

Another mill owner says:

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if the State of North Carolina is a better guardian of the girls and boys of North Carolina than their own parents, their own flesh and blood, why stop at the cotton-mill operatives? Why single them out? Let us pass a bill here that no girl under 14 years old shall run a sewing machine. Let us pass one that none shall use a typewriter; that no girl under 14 shall be a clerk in a store or be a stenographer. Are they not as much objects of the care and solicitude of the State of North Carolina as the factory girls? Why this discrimination? Why are they singled out?

Now, I know it is a fad to say that everything must give way to education. I can afford to say something about education, because I have always been a friend to education.

There is such a thing as carrying it [education] too far. There are other things in North Carolina it is your duty to face besides this [education]. There are the mill interests in North Carolina that ought to be considered. No State can be great, no State can hold any influence in this world, unless it is materially great.

And you can not have education without prosperity. Now this is education gone mad. You are about to sacrifice everything to education. I admit that young girls between 12 and 14 are at a critical point of their lives. There is no doubt about that. But, gentlemen, do you know that working in mills is not harder on them than other work that they have to do?

Notwithstanding the immense space taken up thus far, I can not resist the summing up of the whole thing by quoting from Miss Irene Ashby's article in the American Federationist, striking out of it every sentimental expression which this tender-hearted and brave-souled woman used. Senators may see the picture of this lady surrounded by the children whom she found in these mills with their lives being ruined. You may judge for yourselves from that fine face, and from the miserable faces of the children beside her, what a brave and high-souled woman Miss Ashby is and how infamous the system that would oppress the children which the photograph shows us here.

#### CHILD LIFE VS. DIVIDENDS.

[Irene Ashby-MacFadyen.]

Here are three of them—three of the little slaves of capital, typical of the 20,000 children under 14 now toiling out their lives in the textile mills of the South. Mattie, the little one standing beside me, is 6 years old. She is a spinner. Inside a cotton mill for twelve hours a day she stands in the 4-foot passageway between the spinning frames where the cotton is spun from coarser into fine threads. As it comes down from the roping above now and then it breaks at some part of the long frame, and her baby fingers join the thread and set the bobbins moving again. From daylight to dark she is in the midst of the ceaseless throb and racket of machinery. When I first met her it was Christmas Eve—the eve of the children's festival, when the whole of Christendom celebrates the birth of the Child whose coming was to bring freedom to mankind, not to speak of freedom to children. She was crying, and when I asked the reason, said, between her sobs, that she wanted a doll that would open and shut its eyes. "When would you play with it?" I asked the little toiler, whose weary eyelids were ready to close over her tired eyes directly the long day's work was over. "I should have time a-plenty on Sunday," replied the little slave whose daily wage of 10 cents helped to swell the family income. There are thousands like her in the South.

Sally is only 9. Look into her worn face; not a trace of childhood's glad insouciance about it. It never changes from that fixed expression save when a wan smile crosses it in pitiful response to a kind word. For three long years she has done the same thing that little Mattie is only beginning. A few weeks before this picture was taken she broke down completely with nervous collapse. Continuous work, the hot, unhealthy mill atmosphere, proved too much for her childish brain. She could neither stand nor speak, and her limbs were shaken by convulsive movements. When this picture was taken she was slowly regaining a feeble kind of health, and in a week or two more would be back at her endless toil. There are thousands like her in the South.

I do not know how old Jack is. He does not know himself. He does not know anything except that he has worked since he can remember. I think he may be about 11.

The only sign of interest in life he ever exhibits is shown when an orange is offered to him. There are thousands like him in the South. That is the horror and wrong which is hidden behind the cold, printed words "child labor legislation."

These are American children, dragged into the mills when scarcely out of their babyhood, without education, without opportunity, being robbed of health, morally and physically; forced to labor as in the days of negro slavery negro children never were. With their baby



hands these little slaves are undermining the liberties of the future, not only of the cotton operatives of the South, but of the American working people; not only of the working people, but of the community in which they, for good or evil, are to play so large a part.

And what is the universal reply to your question "Why are they there?"

They are there, it is said "to attract northern capital"—a scathing comment on both those who sell and those who ask the sale.

Take the number of children employed. Statistics are very difficult to obtain.

There is but one of the Southern States in which there is a labor commission—North Carolina. Mr. B. R. Lacey, as labor commissioner, gives in his last report 7,695 children under 14 employed in 261 mills. Taking this as a general average would give at least 20,000 children under 14 in the textile mills of the South.

The Cincinnati Post recently sent a correspondent through the South to investigate the subject of child labor, simply as a matter of news, and particularly cautioned him not to exaggerate. Out of at least 1,000 children employed in five mills in Columbia, S. C., he estimates 400 to be under 12 years of age. Applying this proportion to the above figures would give, at the very lowest computation, 8,000 little children, infants, between 6 and 12, as operatives. He spoke personally to numbers of children who said they were 7 and 8, and others who were so little they did not know their own ages.

The Associated Press reported the president of the Whitney mills as stating before the legislature that 30 per cent of his operatives were under 12 years, which percentage, he says, referred only to the spinning room; but that is startling enough. James K. Orr stated that 25 per cent of his machinery was run by children under 12 years. These cold percentages do not give an adequate expression of their meaning. To the horrified visitor the mills appear to be swarming with little children. The light and easy work of which the managers speak is to stand on their feet all day before a spinning frame, where the threads may break at one end or the other or in the middle at any moment, and when the thread breaks the spool stops and the thread is to be rejoined and the spool started again.

A baby has one frame to attend to, but most have two, many have three, and some have four or five. The boys are generally doffers or sweepers—that is, they have to change the bobbins on the frames as they become full and substitute empty ones. In the exercise of their work they often run 16 or 17 miles a day with their trucks. The little sweeper piles a broom bigger than himself to perform these actions, trivial in themselves, uninterruptedly for twelve hours a day on the average, with only one-half hour for rest and food.

Without regulation of hours there is no reason to prevent the mills working at night, and when they can do so profitably they avail themselves of this permission. I have talked with a little boy of 7 years who worked for forty nights in Alabama, and another child not 9 years old who at 6 years old had been on the night shift eleven months.

A clerk in a cotton mill told me that little boys turned out at 2 in the morning for some trivial fault, afraid to go home, would beg him to allow them to go to sleep on the office floor.

In Georgia it is a common sight to see the children of cotton operatives stretched on the bed dressed as they came from the mills in the morning, too weary to do anything but fling themselves down for rest.

In South Carolina Miss Jane Addams, of Chicago, found a child of 5 working at night in the fine, large, new mills. Only a few weeks ago I stood at 10:30 at night in a mill in Columbia, S. C., controlled and owned by northern capital, where children who did not know their own ages were working from 6 p. m. to 6 a. m., without a moment for rest or food, or a single cessation of the maddening racket of the machinery, in an atmosphere insanitary and clouded with humidity and lint.

#### SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS.

The physical, mental, and moral effect of these long hours of toil and confinement on the children is indescribably sad. Mill children are so stunted that every foreman, as you enter the mill, will tell you that you can not judge their ages. Children may look, he says, to be 11 or 12, and be in reality 14 or 15.

A horrible form of dropsy occurs among the children. A doctor in a city mill, who has made a special study of the subject, tells me that 10 per cent of the children who go to work before 12 years of age, after five years contract active consumption. The lint forms in their lungs a perfect cultivating medium for tuberculosis, while the change from the hot atmosphere of the mill to the chill night or morning air often brings on pneumonia, which frequently, if not the cause of death, is a forerunner of consumption.

How sternly the "pound of flesh" is insisted on by the various employers is illustrated by the case of two little boys of 9 and 11, who had to walk 3 miles to work on the night shift for twelve hours. One night they were five minutes late and were shut out, having to tramp the whole 3 miles back again. The number of accidents to those poor little ones, who do not know the dangers of machinery, is appalling.

In Huntsville, Ala., in January, just before I was there, a child of 8 years, who had been a few weeks in the mills, lost the index and middle finger of her right hand. A child of 7 had lost her thumb a year previously.

In one mill city in the South a doctor told a friend that he had personally amputated more than a hundred babies' fingers mangled in the mill. A cotton merchant in Atlanta told me he had frequently seen mill children without fingers or thumb and sometimes without the whole hand.

So frequent are these accidents that in some mills applicants for employment have to sign a contract that in case of injury in the mill the company will not be held responsible, and parents or guardians sign for minors.

No mill children look healthy. Anyone that does by chance, you are sure to find out, has but recently begun work. They are characterized by extreme pallor and an aged, worn expression infinitely pitiful and incongruous in a child's face.

There is unfortunately no question as to the physical debasement of the mill child. In the finest mill in Columbia, S. C., a magnificent example of splendid enterprise, I found a tiny girl of 5 years old in the spinning room. Her sunbonnet had fallen back onto her neck and her fair hair was covered with the threads that had fallen back on her head from the frame as she worked. She was helper to her sister. Neither child knew her age, but a girl of 8, standing near, told me they were 7 and 5, and worked there all day long. A beautiful little girl of 8, with hectic flush, told me she "hadn't worked but a year."

All holidays are "made up" in South Carolina. A strike occurred at

one mill among some organized employees because they were required to make up Labor Day beforehand. They were locked out and starved into submission.

In Alabama the children in the mills are required to work Thanksgiving Day.

In Georgia a child missing Saturday—a short day—loses one-sixth of her week's wages.

The wages paid these children bear out what I have said in regard to child labor keeping wages low. Many toil for 10 cents a day.

The average wage in North Carolina of the children under 14 is 22 cents a day, and in Georgia 25 cents is a liberal estimate. The Post correspondent gives a sample pay roll, showing an average of \$1.43 a week in a certain spinning room for all children employed. I know of babies working for 5 and 6 cents a day. The girl of 9 I mentioned who has worked at night, when 6 years old received 12½ cents a night, and how earns \$4.16 every two weeks. The two boys who walked 3 miles to their work received 12 and 15 cents a night.

In South Carolina the wages paid to children seem slightly higher. It is a significant fact that the last census figures show a drop in the average wages of cotton operatives during the past twenty years, although there is a slight rise in wages of children under 16. These figures also show that a smaller part of the labor of cotton mills was done by men in 1900 than in 1890, while children under 16 increased over 250 per cent, and women just over 100 per cent in that period.

Child labor has increased beyond all proportion to labor of men and women, and while dividends average 35 per cent, and sometimes rise as high as 80 or 90 per cent, and in Columbia, S. C., run from 28 to 40 per cent, the average wage is steadily dropping.

In one large mill worked by northern capital, in Alabama, a widow and three children, the latter aged, respectively, 12, 9, and 8, worked for 47 cents a day between them.

I know of a man in Alabama who was paid 45 cents a day, and numbers in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama who earn from 60 to 75 cents a day. In South Carolina the coupon system is still used by the mills. Recent photographs taken in South Carolina show pay bags in which the whole cash was deducted for coupons, rent, and medicine.

One operative is known to have worked for fourteen months without receiving a penny in cash, and of course the coupons are only good at the company's stores, where any price the company sees fit can be charged for the necessities of life.

These wages and the condition of helplessness they indicate can only be perpetuated among very ignorant operatives, dependent on their work in the mills for the barest livelihood, incapable of organization, and terrorized into silence. This explains the carelessness of mill owners in regard to the most serious result of child labor—illiteracy.

Common sense tells us that children working ten or twelve hours a day can not get an education, and experience confirms this. In my personal investigations I scarcely ever found a mill child who could read or write. Few knew their letters.

A count made a year ago in August showed 567 children under 12 working in eight mills. Of these, only 122 could read or write.

The mills claim to educate the children of the communities under their charge, and in a few exceptional cases they do, but in others their claim is not borne out by facts. In a large mill in South Carolina, where they say they have all school facilities, the entire enrollment of the village, containing between 6,000 and 8,000 persons, was 100 last February, and in another mill, making the same claim, there was an enrollment of 90 pupils. They were divided into two classes. When the school was visited twenty-two children were in one of these, only twelve of whom were mill employees' children, and ten had worked in the mills from one to three years. The teacher stated that the children were frequently sent for by the management to come into the spinning room out of school, and that in one room eight had been so recalled since the beginning of that school term.

I know of a mill in Alabama, owned entirely by northern capital, where two children of 9 and 11 were so recalled into the spinning room every time they ventured to take a few days at school, the girl never getting any education except when she was too sickly to work, while a boy was too weary after his day's "doffing" ever to go to night school.

The night-school teachers in Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina all say it is impossible to teach the children much. They are too physically weary and sometimes can not keep awake.

It is a serious charge to make that the mill owners of the South, a cultured and frequently religious class, are perpetuating this horrible system, but I am afraid there is no doubt of it. I started my investigations with a good deal of sympathy with these captains of industry, who are facing all the risks of the establishment and upbuilding of a great trade. The personal courtesy and kindness many of them showed me almost blinded me at first to the meaning of their opposition to the enactment of any child-labor law. My sympathy, however, has been worn very thin by the deceptions and evasions to which they lend themselves on this subject. Some, no doubt, honestly believe in the validity of the reasons they advance for child labor—it is so easy to believe a theory very much to our own interest—but the majority know better, especially men from the North and East. In my story of the campaign I show some of the unworthy methods of delaying agitation for which the mill interest, as a whole, is responsible.

I must deal now with specific cases which are not isolated, but typical. The mill owners blame "the idle parent" for child labor and complain that they are helpless against the determination of these people to work their children. With the wages they are paid it is difficult for them to live without employing their children, but apart from this they are often practically obliged to by the management.

A mill largely owned by northern capital recently sent an agent into the surrounding country to collect labor for the newly built portion of the factory. Men were induced to sell their little farms by promises of free schools for their children, a free nursery for the babies, a free library, and plenty of good work at good wages. The free nursery was opened for two months by some ladies and, receiving no support from the mill, was closed. The free library consisted in two boxes of books never unpacked.

The good wages were such as the 47 cents per day that same mill paid to the widow and her three children. Moreover, before obtaining a house these homeless people had to sign a contract giving permission for their children to work.

Accidents are buried in oblivion. A photograph of a child's maimed hand was taken for a newspaper by a local photographer. Next day the partner of the doctor who allowed the picture to be taken had the plate smashed. It was given out that the exposure had not been a success.

## CAMPAIGN FOR CHILD-LABOR LEGISLATION.

For eighteen months I have acted as the special agent of the American Federation of Labor on child-labor legislation in the Southern States.

In December, 1900, at the request of President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, I went to Alabama to gain support for a bill for the prevention of the employment of children in the factories of that State.

As I recounted in my report of that campaign, the bill, the passage of which I was sent to assist, was dead before I reached Montgomery. Technically, this ended my mission; morally, it did not. If the evil was there, a dead bill was no reason for silence.

So I set to work, by personal investigation, to find out if, in this late hour of history, the crime of infant labor had, indeed, appeared in the new South.

I visited personally twenty-four mills in Alabama before the opening of the second session of the legislature at the end of January, 1901.

The state of affairs I discovered was truly appalling. In every one of these mills there were children under 12 years of age working from eleven to twelve hours a day. Six mills out of the twenty-four had worked within a year at night.

In the spinning rooms, brilliantly lighted with electric lights, fitted with the latest machinery turning out, hour after hour, the product which is making huge profits, were to be found little children working from dark until long past dawn, kept awake by cold water being dashed into their faces.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply wish to interrupt the Senator for the purpose of calling his attention to the fact that in his reference a few moments ago to the child-labor laws of North Carolina he fell into an error.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What was it?

Mr. SIMMONS. As I understood the Senator, he stated that North Carolina had a child-labor law which prohibited children under 12 years of age from working in factories—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. But had no law which prohibited children from working in the mines and had no law which provided for an inspection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The statement will be in the RECORD. I have sent it up to the desk.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that is what the Senator said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I beg the Senator not to take my time now, because I have got to go into the legal phase of the argument.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator except to state that the same child-labor law in North Carolina applying to factories applies also to mines.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let it apply to mines. If it was an error, it was on the part of the stenographer. I am not mistaken about the facts, because I hold in my hands the stenographer's original notes about the efforts in North Carolina to defeat attempts to make that law a perfect law at the last session of the legislature.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not desire to enter into any controversy with the Senator, but simply to correct the error which the Senator made in his statement.

## A WARNING TO THE SOUTH.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If there is any person on this floor, including the Senators from the South, who has a greater affection than I for that section of the country, from which I draw my own blood, I do not know it. And now I want to give a solemn warning to my brothers of the South.

I have had some conversation with my friends upon the other side who come from the South. There is one thing which I want to call to your attention—I do not know whether your attention has been called to it or not; certainly mine would not have been if I had not carefully studied the question. It is a serious question.

We have had much of this session taken up with a discussion of the race question. We have had the assertion of the superiority of the white race made time and time again; that the white race would never yield to the black race.

Yet the children who are at work in the southern cotton mills are from the white working class of the South; and this terrible situation stares the South in the face that, *whereas the children of the white working people of the South are going to the mill and to decay, the negro children are going to school and improvement.*

I am glad to see the negro children going to school, but it is enough to wring the heart to think that day by day you are permitting a system to go on which is steadily weakening the white race for the future and steadily strengthening the black race for the future.

It is not in the power of any man to keep "superior" by asserting superiority. The truth of it is the South is face to face with the situation of their white children in the mills and their black children in the schools.

## CAN WE REPUBLICANS ASK HIGH TARIFF ON CHILD-MADE GOODS?

There is another thing which we on this side—the Republican side—might as well take into account. I have here the present tariff law. I was reading before I came up to the Capitol, after I got into the office, the tariff on cotton, the tariff on glass, the tariff on coal. I ask Senators who, like myself, are protectionists, With what grace can we go to the country asking that the tariff be continued on these things when the industries in these lines are supported by cheap child labor?

Mr. KEAN. There is no duty on anthracite coal.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is a duty on soft coal, and the tariff on anthracite coal was removed only for a year.

Mr. GALLINGER. It never was on.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, no matter. Maybe I have been misinformed upon that, but I don't think so. There is a tariff on glass, and I am glad of it. There is a tariff on soft coal, and I am glad of it. There is a tariff on cotton, and I am glad of it; and I also know some of the percentages of the dividends that are made out of those industries. I ask Senators and I ask them solemnly, how are the people to be asked to have any patience with us when we ask that those tariff rates be maintained if we refuse to deprive those very men of the additional commercial advantage of child labor?

## A WARNING TO LABOR—EFFECT OF CHILD LABOR ON WAGES.

That is my warning to the South. And now I wish to speak right here another warning to labor, and I will ask to put into my remarks numerous statements made under oath to prove it. I want the laboring men and women of this country to understand what every labor leader knows—and if he does not know it he is not fit to be a labor leader or any other kind of a leader—that *child labor tends to bring down manhood wages and womanhood wages to the child-wage level.* You are not only killing your children, laboring men, but you are reducing your own manhood wages.

Now, I ask leave to insert without reading affidavits and statements proving nonenforcement of State laws everywhere. They prove the utter inadequacy of the States to handle this evil.

Mr. Spargo, whom I have already quoted on other subjects, uses these strong words on pages 198-200:

At bottom the employers, or rather the system of production for profit, must be held responsible for child labor. There are evidences of this on every hand. We see manufacturers in New Jersey and Pennsylvania getting children from orphan asylums, regardless of their physical, mental, and moral ruin, merely because it pays them. When the glass blowers of Minotola, N. J., went on strike in 1902 the child-labor question was one of their most important issues. The exposures made of the frightful enslavement of little children attracted widespread attention.

When the proprietor of the factory was asked about the employment of young boys 10 and 11 years of age, many of whom often fall asleep and were awakened by the men pouring water over them and at least two of whom died from overexhaustion, he said: "If two men apply to me for work and one has one or two or three children and the other has none, I take the man with children. I need the boys."

In the mills of the South it is frequently made a condition of the employment of married men nor women that all their children shall be bound to work in the same mills. The following is one of the rules posted in a South Carolina cotton mill:

"All children, members of a family, above 12 years of age shall work regularly in the mill, and shall not be excused from service therein without the consent of the superintendent for good cause."

Many times I have heard fathers and mothers—in the North as well as in the South—say that they did not want their children to work, that they could have done without the children's wages and kept them at school a little longer or apprenticed them to better employment, but they were compelled to send them into the mills to work or lose their own places.

With such facts as these before us, it is easy to see that the urgency of the employers' demands for child labor is an important factor in the problem. Underlying all other causes is the fundamental fact that *the exploitation of the children is in the interests of the employing class.*

It may be urged that it is necessary to begin work at an early age because the work they do can not be done by men or women, but the contention is wholly unsupported by facts. There is no work done by boys in the glass factories which men could not do; no skill or training is required to enable one to do the work done by breaker boys in the coal mines.

The work done by children in the textile mills could be done equally well by adults. The fact that in some cases adults are employed to do the work which in other cases is done by children is sufficient proof that child labor is not resorted to because it is inevitable and necessary, but on account of its cheapness.

Going from factory to factory throughout the anthracite counties I sometimes came upon the sign "Girls wanted" nailed to the factory doors. Where the demand for silks and laces is good, as apparently it is most of the time in Pennsylvania, cheap child labor is in urgent demand. It is through it that Pennsylvania manufacturers are able to undersell New England manufacturers, for example. The available and eligible children are not so numerous that they can afford to scrutinize the age certificates too closely.

According to the State factory inspector, there are something over 17,000 girls between the ages of 13 and 16 working in the manufacturing establishments of the State. Of this number approximately 4,000 work all night in the textile mills—

This is nearly as bad as Georgia.



And Mr. Spargo continues:

In some districts, especially in New Jersey, it has long been the custom to import boys from certain orphan asylums and "reformatories" to supply the demand of the manufacturers. These boys are placed in laborers' families, and their board paid for by the employers, who deduct it from the boys' wages. Thus a veritable system of child slavery has developed, remarkably like the old English pauper-apprentice system.

Dr. Peter Roberts, in the *Outlook*, volume 78, September-December, 1904, on page 984, speaks as follows on the effect of child labor on wages:

Another wrong to tender boys and girls employed in silk mills is night work. This is confined to silk plants installed in the anthracite coal fields. In Allentown, Reading, South Bethlehem, Lancaster, etc., children do not work nights, for employers can not get children enough to operate their plants in the day. Mr. Cardiff, manager of a silk-throwing plant in South Bethlehem, said:

"The coal fields is the ideal place for a silk-throwing plant; you get cheap rent, cheap coal, *cheap labor*, and the parents don't object to have their children work nights."

Not in any other industrial center in eastern Pennsylvania are young girls employed in night work. Ten or fifteen years ago night work for girls was unknown in this State.

Miss Ashby says, on the effect of child labor on wages, in the *World's Work*, volume 2, May, 1901, to October, 1901, page 1292, these words:

The frequent plea that the people would starve were it not for their children's earnings is untrue. In the first place, the child seldom earns even its own food and clothes, and several intelligent operatives who had had children in the mill told me that anything these earned was so discounted by ill health that they had to take them out.

It is a well-established economic fact that the family wage is not increased by child labor. If the law forbids the working of the children, the older members of the family must be able to earn enough to support the younger. In time the family wage is actually lessened by child labor, for the standard of health, education, and needs are lowered.

In arguments bearing on the hardships to individuals of stopping child labor, "the poor widow" bulks large. One's anxiety for the poor widow diminishes when one finds that she is made the excuse in every country for retaining child labor, and that when investigation is made her contribution in the shape of baby laborers is about 2 per cent, as recently shown in England.

And again, on page 1294, she says:

In time, therefore, the earning, and with the earning the spending, capacity of workers in other trades will be lessened, and the development of local trade be checked, even though the cotton mills may make large dividends.

Another disastrous tendency of unregulated child labor is to substitute *the woman and the child for the man*. In North Carolina some of the mill owners speak complacently of their operatives being "loyal and peaceable, because composed chiefly of women and children." Many managers expressed the hope to me that they might soon be able to do without men almost entirely.

Mr. Owen R. Lovejoy in his article on "Schoolhouse or coal breaker," in volume 80 of the *Outlook*, May-August, 1905, on page 1018, says:

The third factor contributing to the volume of child labor in this region is the attitude of the employer. One is everywhere assured that these children work in the breakers only during the summer months, beginning in April and returning to school when the snow falls. This is true of many of the boys, yet the breaker continues to run and the slate is picked from the coal at all seasons of the year.

If the boys are not there in winter, *by whom is the work performed?* When the boys come on in the spring, whose places do they take at the coal chute? The fact is, a boy of 12 working for 50 cents or 60 cents a day, can do as much work in some parts of the breaker as a man who would demand \$1 a day. The law of supply and demand explains the rest.

Again, we should fall into error were we to conclude that the coal operator is greedy above other employers. He is a business man facing the problems of the business world. Competition with other producers is keen. The appetite of his stockholders for dividends is insatiable. The obvious duty of the superintendent of any department in the concern is to get the work done as efficiently and cheaply as possible. Frequently employers when questioned regarding certain little boys in the breaker have replied with unconcern: "We have their certificate of age all right. That lets us out."

#### EFFECT ON WAGES.

Mr. Kellogg Durland, whose affidavit I have already presented, in his article of May 9, 1903, on "Child labor in Pennsylvania," published in volume 74 of the *Outlook*, May-August, 1903, says this as to the effect of child labor on wages, on page 125:

Going from factory to factory throughout the anthracite counties, I sometimes came upon the sign "Girls wanted" nailed to the factory doors. Where the demand for silks and laces is good, as apparently it is most of the time in Pennsylvania, cheap child labor is in urgent demand. It is though that Pennsylvania manufacturers are able to undersell New England manufacturers, for example. The available and eligible children are not so numerous that they can afford to scrutinize the age certificates too closely.

#### CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAW. I.

Mr. President, I come now to the constitutionality of this proposed law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Would it interrupt the Senator from Indiana if I were to ask him a single question?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not a bit.

Mr. ALDRICH. I agree fully with the Senator as to the serious character of this problem, and I should like him, in

considering the constitutional aspect of the question, if he will, to give his opinion upon one subject.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have in New England laws prohibiting, for obvious reasons, the employment of women and children for more than fifty-eight hours a week. In the South women and children are employed from sixty-six to seventy-two hours a week, we will say. Does the Senator think it is possible that Congress can constitutionally regulate the hours of labor in a State for humanitarian reasons?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will answer that question when I come to it. Very frankly I will say to the Senator that as to the question of *power*, constitutional power, so far as the products of that labor enter into interstate commerce, I have not the slightest doubt of it. The question of *policy* is a different thing. What I propose that we shall do is to differentiate the question of constitutional *power* to pass this bill from the question of *policy*, with which Senators are confusing it.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, please let me go on with that. The Senator from Oregon asked practically the same question. I do not think there is any question about the power. I think it has been clearly decided. I hope the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who wants to be converted on the constitutional side, will give me as much of his attention as he can during my discussion.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am particularly anxious, as no doubt all other Senators are, to hear the Senator's legal argument. He has already been speaking over three hours.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to him in all kindness that he must be tired, and that several of us would like to hear him in the morning, when we are more fresh, because it is going to take a great deal of argument to convert me, I assure him.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I would be glad to yield, but I am afraid to-morrow is preempted. I would otherwise be glad to yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will be back in a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right. Now, to get into the constitutional phase of this question.

#### WHY THE CONSTITUTION WAS ADOPTED.

Of course it is not necessary or perhaps admissible for anybody in addressing a body of men like this to refer to the purposes of the Constitution or why the Articles of Confederation were abandoned and the reasons for having the Constitution. Everyone is familiar with them. There was an utter breakdown of government because each of the States under the Articles of Confederation imposed all kinds of commercial regulations, and it became necessary, if the Government was to hang together any longer, to give Congress *all the power* over the subject of *regulating commerce* which the States before had, so far as concerned commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

Will any Senator here who adheres to the theory of strict construction contend that before the Constitution was adopted each State did not have *absolute* power over commerce within its own borders—power to regulate, power to prohibit, power to do anything? I pause for a reply. I hear none. The power of the States over commerce was *absolutely sovereign* under the Articles of Confederation. Of course no Senator will deny that.

But *all* such power which the States had under the Articles of Confederation were by the Constitution *given to Congress*. The States parted with that power absolutely, and the power given to Congress, so far as interstate traffic is concerned, is *as complete and absolute as the power of the State over State commerce*. Of course those are only fundamentals. That power over commerce among themselves which the States had under the Articles of Confederation—and *all* the power they had over such commerce—was given to the Nation under the Constitution.

It was given in a clause with which every lawyer, of course, is more than familiar, and with which every law student is familiar.

The absolute power which the States had under the Articles of Confederation was given to Congress in the following words of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power \* \* \* to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

"To regulate commerce." What did that phrase mean? It had a definite and distinct meaning at that time. It had a "legal meaning" at that time. Also, it had a "popular" meaning at that time; and they were all the same. The laws concerning the "regulation of commerce" with which the colonists were familiar, with which the statesmen of that day were familiar, and all the lawyers were familiar, were the laws of England, from which country we had recently separated.

## MEANING OF PHRASE "TO REGULATE COMMERCE."

Nobody will deny that. Very well. There were in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted some twenty-seven acts of the English Parliament in which the phrase "to regulate commerce" occurs. In each one of them those words means in those laws "prohibition" of commerce in some form or other or in some article of commerce.

So when the fathers lifted out of the English statutes and put into the Constitution the phrase "to regulate commerce," they lifted out words that had a definite meaning in the acts of the British Parliament which were directly before them, which had affected them, and which in every instance meant to "prohibit" commerce in some manner or in some article.

So we see that the scope of this power given to Congress by the Constitution is very broad indeed, and I will not take up very much time in reading to the Senate decisions of the Supreme Court showing how absolutely unlimited it is. For instance, as showing the scope of this power, the breadth of it, what can be done under it, perhaps no better illustration can be found than that of the very early case of the *United States v. Coombs*, which is reported in 12 Peters. That was in 1838.

Congress passed a law providing for the criminal punishment of anybody who recovered any wreckage from a ship that was washed above high tide. Coombs was indicted under that statute. He defended upon the ground that there was no authority in Congress to pass any such law; that it impaired the police power of the States. The Supreme Court held that it was a valid law, *not under the admiralty clause*, because they held that the admiralty clause did not reach the water mark above tidewater. But the Supreme Court held that it was a proper exercise of the power of Congress under the Constitution, under the clause of the Constitution which gives to Congress the power to regulate commerce, and not at all a violation of the police powers of the States. Justice Story, the second greatest jurist we ever had—

Mr. NELSON. Please give the title of the case.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. *United States v. Coombs*, 12 Peters, page 78.

Mr. Justice Story, in deciding that case, said:

But we are of the opinion that under the clause of the Constitution giving power to Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States" Congress possessed the power to punish offenses of the sort which are enumerated in the ninth section of the act of 1825, now under consideration. The power to regulate commerce includes the power to regulate navigation, as connected with the commerce of foreign nations and among the States. It was so held and decided by this court, after the most deliberate consideration, in the case of *Gibbons v. Ogden* (9 Wheat., 189-198). It does not stop at the mere boundary line of a State, nor is it confined to acts done on the water or in the necessary course of the navigation thereof.

Then the Supreme Court goes on to set out the scope of the power, that it includes such a law, for example, so widely removed as a law making it a criminal offense for any person to recover the wreckage of a ship. This man had stolen some wreckage which had been washed ashore. They held that it was a burden on commerce, and, therefore, the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution covered it; that it was a regulation of foreign commerce. I merely cite that case to show how broad the power is.

## "REGULATE" AND "PROHIBIT."

It was not very long after the Constitution was adopted until there arose the very question which we have here raised, the question as to whether under the commerce clause Congress had the power, in regulating commerce, to "prohibit" commerce in any article, and that was decided in the affirmative in the case which every lawyer has had by heart since he went to law school—in *Gibbons v. Ogden*, in the great opinion by Chief Justice Marshall.

He took up the question of embargo laws, going on to show, first, that the power over interstate commerce was precisely the same as over foreign commerce.

We had been confronted with the exercise of the power of Congress to prohibit commerce in the embargo act, one of the very first acts passed, and that was done exclusively under the clause, says the Supreme Court, giving Congress power over foreign commerce.

The universally acknowledged power of the Government to impose embargoes must also be considered as showing that all America is united in that construction which comprehends navigation in the word "commerce."

When Congress imposed that embargo, which for a time engaged the attention of every man in the United States, the avowed object of the law was the protection of commerce and the avoiding of war. By its friends and its enemies it was treated as a commercial, not as a war measure. The persevering earnestness and zeal with which it was opposed in a part of our country which supposed its interests to be vitally affected by the act can not be forgotten. A want of acuteness in discovering objections to a measure to which they felt the most deep-rooted hostility will not be imputed to those who were arrayed in oppo-

sition to this. Yet they never suspected that navigation was no branch of trade, and was, therefore, not comprehended in the power to regulate commerce. They did, indeed, contest the constitutionality of the act, but on a principle which admits the construction for which the appellant contends. They denied that the particular law in question was made in pursuance of the Constitution, not because the power could not act directly on vessels, but because a perpetual embargo was the annihilation, and not the regulation of commerce. In terms they admitted the applicability of the words used in the Constitution to vessels; and that, in a case which produced a degree and an extent of excitement calculated to draw forth every principle on which legitimate resistance could be sustained. No example could more strongly illustrate the universal understanding of the American people on this subject.

Then Chief Justice Marshall gets more directly to the question of "prohibition." Speaking of and defining the power to "regulate commerce," Chief Justice Marshall says:

It is the power to regulate—that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution. These are expressed in plain terms and do not affect the questions which arise in this case or which have been discussed at the bar.

If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of Congress, though limited to specified objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, is vested in Congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of the power as are found in the Constitution of the United States.

Then Chief Justice Marshall takes up the answer to the argument that the power might be "abused," which I intend to delay to a later part of my own argument, which is chiefly the argument here interposed to this bill.

UNITED STATES *v.* MARIGOLD.

Of course this is still on the general scope of the power. But the Supreme Court soon held directly—decided directly—the power of prohibition.

That was done in the case of the *United States v. Marigold*. In *United States v. Marigold* Congress had passed a law solely and exclusively under the interstate and foreign commerce clause, "prohibiting" the importation of counterfeit coin, and providing a penalty for doing it. It was conceded in the opinion, it was conceded in the pleas, and it was conceded in passing the act that the only authority for it was to be found in the clause regulating commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

Marigold imported some of this coin; he was indicted under this law, and he resisted upon the ground, among others, that there was no authority in Congress; that that was a police power of the State.

The inquiry first propounded—

Says the Supreme Court in deciding this question, and Justice Daniel delivered the opinion—

The inquiry first propounded upon this record points obviously to the answer which concedes to Congress the power here drawn in question.

Congress is, by the Constitution, vested with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and however at periods of high excitement an application of the terms "to regulate commerce," such as would embrace absolute prohibition, may have been questioned, yet since the passage of the embargo and nonintercourse laws and the repeated judicial sanctions those statutes have received, it can scarcely at this day be open to doubt that every subject falling within the legitimate sphere of commercial regulation may be partially or wholly excluded when either measure shall be demanded by the safety or by the important interests of the entire Nation.

Such exclusion can not be limited to particular classes or descriptions of commercial subjects; it may embrace manufactures, bullion, coin, or any other thing. The power once conceded, it may operate on any and every subject of commerce to which the legislative discretion may apply it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator give us the book and page?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; *United States v. Marigold*, 9 Howard, page 560, and he will find the portion of the opinion which I quoted on page 567.

Mr. President, that, of course, was a direct, definite declaration that the casuistry of no lawyer in the United States or elsewhere can escape, that the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States is absolute and includes the power to "prohibit" any subject of commerce from interstate or foreign commerce. The decision is so clear, emphatic, and unequivocal that it would not be proper for me to waste time in commenting upon it.

The next case in which this absolute power of Congress, under the clause which I have quoted—

Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes—

is sustained in equally emphatic and unavoidable language, is the case of the *United States v. Forty-three Gallons of Whisky*. That is the title of the case.

## THE FORTY-THREE GALLONS OF WHISKY CASE.

It is a case which every one knows, and one with which my friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is par-



ticularly familiar, because it occurred in the county of Polk, in the State of Minnesota. It was the case of a libel by the Government of forty-three gallons of whisky that had been brought into the State of Minnesota and into the county of Polk. That county was not within an Indian reservation. It had been at one time, but it had become an organized county of the State.

It had nothing to do with the Indians any more than a county in Ohio or Indiana. But forty-three gallons of whisky had been taken into that county, and I think some of it was sold to an Indian who happened to be a member of a tribe living in some other portion of the State.

The owner of the whisky resisted the libel upon the ground that the act of Congress under which he was prosecuted was beyond the power of Congress to pass. He said that this was purely within a State. He said it was not even within the limits of an Indian reservation; that it could not possibly be any trade with an Indian tribe, and that in any event Congress had no power to "prohibit;" that "prohibiting" was not "regulating commerce" with the Indian tribes.

And so the question that we have here, as in the case of the *United States v. Marigold*, was directly before the court in the case of *Forty-three Gallons of Whisky*.

Congress, under its constitutional power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes, may not only "prohibit" the unlicensed introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the "Indian country," but extend such prohibition to territory in proximity to that occupied by Indians.

In deciding the case—and the opinion was rendered by Mr. Justice Davis—the Supreme Court uses the language which I will read. The whole question of the power of Congress under this clause was examined, and the court says:

Under the articles of confederation, the United States had the power of regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians not members of any of the States; provided, that the legislative right of a State within its own limits be not infringed or violated. Of necessity these limitations rendered the power of no practical value. This was seen by the Convention which framed the Constitution; and Congress now has the exclusive and absolute power to "regulate commerce."

We are trying to find out what the words "to regulate" mean, are we not?

with the Indian tribes—a power as broad and as free from restrictions as that to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Having thus defined the power, he goes on:

The Indian country, as defined by the act of 1834, was at that date so remote from settlements that there was no occasion to extend the prohibition beyond its limits. It has since then been so narrowed by successive treaties that the white population is now all around it and regarding it with a wistful eye.

In view of this changed condition it would be strange indeed if the commercial power, lodged solely with Congress and unrestrained as it is by State lines, did not extend to the exclusion of spirituous liquors intended to corrupt the Indians not only from existing Indian country, but from that which has ceased to be so by reason of its cession to the United States.

But if Congress, under the commercial clause, has power to "prohibit" the introduction of whisky made of corn, why has it not the power to "prohibit" the transportation of goods made by children? So far as the power is concerned, does the material or its method of manufacture have anything to do with the power?

It might have something to do with the policy, but does it have anything to do with the power? For, mark you, the power of Congress over the regulation of commerce with the Indian tribes is precisely the same, and not otherwise in any respect, as is the power to regulate commerce among the several States.

Mr. SIMMONS. Please give the volume.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. *Ninety-three United States*, page 188. The quotation is on pages 191 and 196.

Perhaps as important a case in its indirect holding as any, except the one next after that, that I shall come to, which is the famous *Rahrer* case, which grew out of a provision of the Wilson bill, and the Wilson bill grew out of the decision of the Iowa liquor cases, did it not? The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] will remember.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me a moment?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. RAYNER. I am listening to this legal argument with great interest. Suppose we pass a law here providing that no goods shall be transported from State to State not made by a labor union; have we the power to do that?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We have the power to do that, but it would be poor policy. Chief Justice Marshall answered your question.

Mr. RAYNER. I should like to see where Chief Justice Marshall or any Chief Justice, judge, or lawyer answered that question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He has answered it.

Mr. RAYNER. I should like to see that decision.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am going to come to that in a moment;

but I want to get through with these decisions. All there is in the Senator's suggestion is the old argument about the "abuse of power"—that if you concede the power to do this, then you have the power to do that; and because you have that power you will do it, of course, and that would be a bad thing, and therefore you have not any power at all—that's your argument.

I will come to all that argument in a minute. There is no question about our power, but nobody would do it. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] was asked that question by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in the discussion of the quarantine bill. I have the answer of the Senator from Wisconsin here. I am sorry he has not honored me with his presence this afternoon, since he said that he is interested in the constitutional phase. He said the question is unthinkable, because nobody is ever going to propose such a thing as that. That was exactly the answer Benjamin Franklin gave when practically the same question was put to him before the bar of the British Parliament when he was being examined there.

It is not to be assumed that the representatives of an intelligent people are going to be so foolish as to do anything like that suggested by the Senator. But that has nothing to do with the power; and as a portion of my constitutional argument I am going to meet that, because the Supreme Court has taken up exactly that question. I shall do it later on to the Senator's satisfaction, unless, of course, he is determined not to be satisfied about our power to end this universal infamy of child labor.

#### THE RAHRER CASE.

I wish to read the *Rahrer* case. There is not a great deal of it, but in its direct motive it is probably as important as the *Marigold* case, or probably as important as the case of *Lesey v. Hardin*—I think that is the name of the Iowa liquor case. In that case—*Lesey v. Hardin*—the court held, as we all remember, that the State of Iowa had no power whatever over the importation into that State of liquor as long as it was kept in the original package.

To meet that a provision was put in the Wilson bill, that in any State the subjects of interstate commerce were subjected to the laws of any State when they reach there. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] shakes his head.

Mr. BACON. Not when they reach there. Does the Senator mean when they reach there?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; it was broader than that—the laws of the various States. I am glad the Senator corrected me there, because it makes the argument all the more important. This case arose in the State of Kansas, which prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors.

It was brought up, I believe, on a test case, where the liquor was in an original package, and only in an original package, and it was attempted to be disposed of by the agent of one dealer who lived in Kansas City. It was seized under the laws of the State of Kansas.

The law of the State of Kansas was strengthened by the section of the Wilson bill which subjected all articles of interstate commerce to the laws of the various States. The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States. *Rahrer*, who was resisting the law, said that it was unconstitutional because it violated that clause of the Constitution which gives Congress power over commerce among the States.

But the Supreme Court held that that had been obviated by the Wilson bill subjecting all interstate commerce to the laws of the various States, and in so holding here is what the court said. The opinion was delivered by Chief Justice Fuller:

By the adoption of the Constitution the ability of the several States to act upon the matter solely in accordance with their own will was extinguished, and the legislative will of the General Government substituted. No affirmative guaranty was hereby given to any State of the right to demand as between it and the others what it could not have obtained before; while the object was undoubtedly sought to be attained of preventing commercial regulations partial in their character or contrary to the common interests. And the magnificent growth and prosperity of the country attest the success which has attended the accomplishment of that object. But this furnishes no support to the position that Congress could not, in the exercise of the discretion reposed in it, concluding that the common interests did not require entire freedom in the traffic—

"Entire freedom in the traffic, mind you—

in ardent spirits, enact the law in question.

But this amounts absolutely, as was pointed out at the time and was pointed out in every law journal and discussion in the United States when the *Rahrer* decision was handed down, as the Senator from Maryland very well knows, to a prohibition of commerce in liquors or in anything else, that Congress might by a law subject to the laws of the various States.

And because the law of Kansas prohibited the sale of such articles of interstate commerce, and if it prohibited the sale of it, as was said in *Brown v. Maryland*, it prohibited the thing itself; it amounted to the exclusion of it.

As the Senator from Georgia pointed out a moment ago, when he very properly corrected me, *every* State might have a law prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors or of anything else—of child-made goods, for example—and if an act of Congress putting all subjects of interstate commerce under the operation of the State laws is valid, then Congress has in itself actually prohibited and excluded from interstate commerce this article. That was the thing that so excited the bar and the country.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me to ask him a question, I do not propose to argue it at all, but I wish the Senator's view of it?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

#### THE QUESTION OF POWER OR POLICY.

Mr. BACON. Even if we concede the power of Congress to prohibit the introduction of an article, does the Senator recognize no difference between the power to prohibit the introduction of an article vicious in itself or objectionable for any reason, as most of these decisions pass upon questions of that kind, and an article not objectionable in itself, not vicious, or in any manner detrimental to the public good—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. BACON. An article thus not objectionable, but where the point of the objection simply is as to the manner in which it has been produced in the State?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator asks me that as a question of power?

Mr. BACON. I am asking the Senator's view, whether or not he recognizes any distinction between the two.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand your question. As a question of *power*, no; none in the world.

Mr. BACON. None whatever?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But, yes; as a question of *policy*. We have the power. It is a power which we can abuse. But if we do abuse that power, which in us is unlimited, the remedy is at the ballot box, as was pointed out by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons v. Ogden*, where the very question was raised. No; I recognize no distinction whatever so far as the *power* is concerned.

Mr. BACON. Now, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So far as policy is concerned, of course; and I will say another thing. The Senator is a very learned lawyer, and he will recall that the Supreme Court has decided over and over again that the question of policy was something for us to pass upon, and upon which the Supreme Court itself has absolutely refused to pass.

Mr. BACON. I simply desire to ask the Senator this question, Is the logical conclusion of his position intended by him to go to this extent or to be thus understood, that Congress has the arbitrary power to prohibit the introduction of any article from one State into another State regardless of the reason upon which it may put that prohibition?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir; I can show—

Mr. BACON. Practically unlimited power?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I can show it.

Mr. BACON. To prohibit it absolutely?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; to prohibit it absolutely.

Mr. BACON. That is the logic of the Senator's argument.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. Would not that, followed to its logical conclusion, mean that Congress could absolutely prohibit commerce among the States?

Mr. BACON. Of course.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly. That question was raised in *Gibbons v. Ogden*. The Senator certainly did not hear me read from Chief Justice Marshall's opinion.

Mr. FULTON. That Congress can prohibit commerce between the States?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; he said the argument would be exactly the argument made now.

Mr. FULTON. No such argument has ever been pronounced in *Gibbons v. Ogden* or any other case. It can not be found in any case.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I call the attention of the Senator to a paragraph in the *Rahrer* case that he did not read:

The power of the State to impose restraints and burdens upon persons and property in conservation and promotion of the public health, good order, and prosperity—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know what the Senator is going to read. If he is reading to me he can stop, because I am familiar with it. Nobody questions that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will not read it all, but let me finish the sentence:

is a power originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to the General Government nor directly restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and essentially exclusive.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator might as well read me something from the Bible. Nobody questions that. That has not anything to do with the particular point to which I was calling the attention of the Senate.

Now, I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to this. In *Gibbons v. Ogden* there was a definition of the *power* to pass an embargo law. An embargo was an absolute prohibition of commerce, and the argument was made against it that we had no such power under the Constitution, because, they said, it meant the *annihilation* of commerce. Here is what Chief Justice Marshall said—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator mean to contend that the power of Congress over foreign commerce is the same as its power over domestic commerce?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am coming to that in a minute. Here are the decisions. Does the Senator see those three cases there [indicating]?

Mr. ALDRICH. I see the books.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator from Rhode Island deny that our power over foreign commerce is precisely the same as our power over interstate commerce, and that our power over interstate commerce is exactly as great as the power over foreign commerce? Does the Senator contend that—

Mr. ALDRICH. As I understand the decisions of the court, they are that our power over foreign commerce, under two clauses of the Constitution, is absolute. But they have never said that as to domestic commerce, in my opinion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall read in just a moment the decisions of the Supreme Court where they do say exactly that in so many words—that the power of Congress over domestic commerce is precisely the same as it is over foreign commerce. In the exercise of that power, I am going to call the Senator's attention to something the Senator himself helped to do.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Senator allow me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. RAYNER. Only for a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. RAYNER. Is it not the logical result of your argument, leaving out the question of policy, that we have the power to pass a law here to-day absolutely prohibiting commercial intercourse between the States? I am speaking of the power now, not the policy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will permit me, I will answer him in the language of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], who I expected to ask me just that question, but he has gone away, for some reason. So I prepared to answer him out of his own mouth. The Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] asked the Senator from Wisconsin a question about like that.

Mr. RAYNER. No; I do not want that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. When the Senator asks me a question he must let me answer it in my own way. The Senator from Wisconsin answered the question this way: "Well, it is an impossible question. Congress would never think of passing such a law."

Mr. RAYNER. I want to say to the Senator that this is not a lawyer's answer, because nothing is impossible if we have the power. I am not asking about the policy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; things are impossible to the Senator if he considers his constituents and desires to retain his seat.

Mr. RAYNER. I do not care enough about the seat upon such a principle.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am answering the Senator in my own language, and I happen to be using the language of a very fair lawyer. Chief Justice Marshall said that very thing, that when we abuse the power—

Mr. RAYNER. But I want the Senator's opinion. I want to know if we can pass a law here to-day absolutely prohibiting commercial intercourse between the States—whether that will be the exercise of constitutional power. I should like to have an answer to that question.



Mr. BEVERIDGE. I say it is an impossible question.

Mr. RAYNER. That is your answer to it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let me suggest to the Senator a question. Will you ask me whether or not I think we have the power to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of the milk of a cow milked by a young lady 18 years old? Undoubtedly we have the power, but undoubtedly we would not do it. We have the power to prohibit the transportation through interstate commerce of any article. What did the Marigold case say? What did the Forty-three Gallons Whisky case say?

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do. I am coming to another case.

Mr. CARMACK. I ask the Senator if the United States Government could put the young lady in the penitentiary for not being 18 years old? [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. Never! God forbid! Protect the young ladies at all hazards. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. BACON. I should like to suggest to the Senator if there is anything in political history or in all the interstate commerce law to show that the object of that feature in the Constitution was not to facilitate commerce between the States and prevent any barrier. Yet the Senator would say that legitimately it can be construed to erect barriers which would absolutely destroy it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I say to the Senator and to the Senate in answer to that that not only has it been so construed ever since the first opinion was handed down on the subject by the Supreme Court, but that Congress has time and again accepted such a construction and done exactly that thing, and I propose to cite, before I get through this argument, law after law where there is absolute prohibition.

During the delivery of Mr. BEVERIDGE's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMOOT in the chair.) The Senator from Indiana will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 7709) to revise, codify, and amend the penal laws of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BEVERIDGE resumed his speech. After having spoken until a few minutes before 5 o'clock,

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, he has now addressed the Senate for between four and five hours, and he must be tired. It is evident that this legal and constitutional argument can not well be finished to-night, and I inquire whether it would not suit the Senator to suspend and finish his argument in the morning, taking the floor immediately after the close of the routine morning business?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It would be very agreeable indeed to me, I will say to the Senator, if it can be arranged. I have only got started in this constitutional part.

Mr. NELSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana may continue his argument to-morrow immediately after the close of the routine morning business.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has given notice that he will call up an appropriation bill in the morning, and I think some Senator has given notice of a speech to-morrow morning—the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], if I remember correctly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] has given notice of a speech to-morrow.

Mr. CARTER. I do not desire to overwork, or to be the means of overworking, the Senator from Indiana. I realize that he has continued many hours of the session to-day. Yet I trust that some hour may be fixed to-morrow for the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator—say at 2 o'clock.

Mr. PATTERSON. That depends upon how much time the Senator from Indiana may be allowed for his argument. He

means if he has a chance to proceed immediately after the close of the routine business?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly. That was the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rose simply to ask if any unanimous-consent agreement had been asked with reference to 2 o'clock to-morrow?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was asked that the Senator from Indiana be allowed to resume the floor after the routine morning business to-morrow to conclude his remarks.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before I agree to that I wish to call attention to the fact that I have given notice that I should call up to-day Senate bill 6147, which is a very urgent bill. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana, and was pleased to do so. In the meantime the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] gave notice that they would speak to-morrow, and, as we all know, memorial exercises are to be held on Friday.

I now rise, Mr. President, for the purpose of saying that on Saturday, after the routine morning business, if there be no appropriation bill under consideration, I will beg the indulgence of the Senate to consider the bill in which I am interested, and which ought to be taken up at an early day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator was extremely kind to me, and I wish to state my appreciation of his kindness.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CARTER. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota the acceptance of an amendment that the Senator from Indiana conclude his remarks by 2 o'clock.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator that of course I will try to do that, and certainly I shall not take much longer. The Senator can understand that if there are interruptions it would prolong the time.

Mr. CARTER. I wish to have the Senator conclude his remarks, of course. I suggest as a modification of the request for unanimous consent that immediately after the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, at whatever time he may conclude, the floor be accorded to me for some brief observations.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. That is very courteous of the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I make the modification, and renew my request for unanimous consent in that form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana be permitted to resume the floor immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business to-morrow, for the purpose of concluding his remarks, and that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] may take the floor immediately after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Indiana for the purpose of addressing the Senate in accordance with the notice he has heretofore given. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CHANGES IN DISTRICT STREET-RAILWAY TRACKS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to change the notice I gave. On Wednesday, after the routine morning business, I will ask to have considered the bill (S. 6147) authorizing changes in certain street-railway tracks within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### CONTINUATION OF POSTAL COMMISSION.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) continuing the Postal Commission until the close of the present session of Congress was read the first time by its title.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the joint resolution be put on its passage.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the Joint Commission of Congress appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, approved June 26, 1906, shall not be deemed to be discharged by the presentation to the Senate or the House of Representatives of its said report, but is hereby continued in existence with all the powers created by said act until the termination of the present session of Congress, for the purpose of completing the preparation, printing, and publication of the record of the hearings held by said Commission, and for the preparation, printing, and publication of an index and digest of the same. And the unexpended balance of the appropriation for said Commission in said act shall be available for the expenses of the said Commission. And that payments that have been made or are hereafter to be made on account of the expenses of the said Commission upon vouch-*

ers approved by the chairman thereof shall be deemed held and taken and are hereby declared to be conclusive upon all departments and officers of the Government.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BACON. I would inquire to what the joint resolution relates?

Mr. PENROSE. The purpose of the joint resolution is to enable the Postal Commission to complete the compiling of the testimony, which is very voluminous. It is the Joint Postal Commission of Congress, the report of which I submitted this morning.

Mr. BACON. That is what I rose to learn—the subject-matter to which it relates.

Mr. PENROSE. The fear was that the Commission with the presentation of its report to-day would go out of existence, and this is to continue it until the loose ends can be gathered in and the work completed.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LOWER COLORADO RIVER.

Mr. FLINT obtained the floor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KEAN. I was going to move an executive session.

Mr. FLINT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7776) to provide for protecting the interests of the United States on the lower Colorado River, for the establishment of the Imperial Valley and the Colorado River irrigation projects, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. FLINT. I will ask to have the matter go over. There does not seem to be a sufficient number of Senators here. It is a very important bill, and I want to have it carefully considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over.

#### REPRINT OF PURE-FOOD LAW.

Mr. HEYBURN. An order was made Saturday for a reprint of the pure-food law, with the accompanying documents. I ask that that order be rescinded and that an order be made for the printing of the matter included in the former order as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is changed as now requested.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 29, 1907, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28, 1907.*

##### PROMOTION IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Asst. Engineer California Charles McMillan to be first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 22, 1906, in place of First Asst. Engineer Henry Todd Powell, resigned.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### *Infantry Arm—To be first lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. Robert G. Caldwell, Eighteenth Infantry, from July 2, 1906, vice Young, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Hugh A. Parker, Twenty-eighth Infantry, from July 2, 1906, vice Parker (W. M.), Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Tillotson, Nineteenth Infantry, from July 3, 1906, vice Clark, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Will D. Wills, Twenty-eighth Infantry, from July 7, 1906, vice Hunt, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur T. Dalton, Twenty-seventh Infantry, from July 13, 1906, vice Simonds, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Otho E. Michaelis, Fifth Infantry, from July 28, 1906, vice Rucker, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. William C. Stoll, Eleventh Infantry, from July 28, 1906, vice Frith, Twenty-ninth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ira A. Smith, Nineteenth Infantry, from August 7, 1906, vice Ansell, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James E. Ware, Fourteenth Infantry, from August 7, 1906, vice Peck, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank W. Dawson, Twenty-ninth Infantry, from August 8, 1906, vice Anderson, Nineteenth Infantry, resigned.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### COLORADO.

Hockley T. Hamill to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Clear Creek and State of Colorado, in place of Hockley T. Hamill. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1907.

Carrie James to be postmaster at Loveland, in the county of Larimer and State of Colorado, in place of David James, deceased.

Francis M. Tague to be postmaster at Las Animas, in the county of Bent and State of Colorado, in place of Francis M. Tague. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1907.

##### FLORIDA.

J. P. Schell to be postmaster at Chipley, in the county of Washington and State of Florida, in place of John S. Alley, deceased.

##### ILLINOIS.

Carson T. Metcalf to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Greene and State of Illinois, in place of John D. Robards. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1906.

Peter A. Nelson to be postmaster at Lamont, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in place of Peter A. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1907.

William H. Pease to be postmaster at Harvey, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in place of William H. Pease. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1907.

Rollin Waite to be postmaster at McHenry, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

##### INDIANA.

George W. Patchell to be postmaster at Union City, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana, in place of James S. Reeves, deceased.

Thomas Rudd to be postmaster at Butler, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana, in place of Thomas Rudd. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1906.

Amanda Sullivan to be postmaster at Garrett, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana, in place of Amanda Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1907.

##### IOWA.

Eugene J. Birchard to be postmaster at Kellogg, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

Nettie Lewis to be postmaster at Marcus, in the county of Cherokee and State of Iowa, in place of Francis A. Lewis, deceased.

##### KANSAS.

Thomas H. Earnest to be postmaster at Cherryvale, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas, in place of Thomas H. Earnest. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

James J. Evans to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Lyon and State of Kansas, in place of James J. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1907.

James S. Price to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas, in place of William S. Baxter, removed.

##### MAINE.

Seth T. Snipe to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine, in place of Hiram A. Huse, deceased.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

Louis L. Campbell to be postmaster at Northampton, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, in place of Louis L. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1907.

Walter L. Shaw to be postmaster at Palmer, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in place of Walter L. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1907.

##### MICHIGAN.

Martin N. Brady to be postmaster at Saginaw West Side, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan, in place of Martin N. Brady. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1907.

Will H. Brunson to be postmaster at St. Johns, in the county



of Clinton and State of Michigan, in place of Will H. Brunson. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1907.

Charles Gauntlett to be postmaster at Milan, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, in place of Charles W. Pullen. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1907.

John Hanna to be postmaster at Birmingham, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan, in place of John Hanna. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1907.

## MINNESOTA.

Ole H. Grasmoe to be postmaster at Fairfax, in the county of Renville and State of Minnesota. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

O. J. Simmons to be postmaster at Austin, in the county of Mower and State of Minnesota, in place of Samuel Sweningsen. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1907.

## MISSOURI.

Thomas Sharp to be postmaster at Wellsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri, in place of Thomas Sharp. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1907.

Wesley W. Wehrli to be postmaster at Mound City, in the county of Holt and State of Missouri, in place of Wesley W. Wehrli. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1907.

## NEW JERSEY.

Herbert H. Biddulph to be postmaster at Montclair, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in place of William L. Doremus, deceased.

Frank A. Brown to be postmaster at Cranbury, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey, in place of Frank A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1907.

## NEW YORK.

Samuel H. Palmer to be postmaster at Ogdensburg, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York, in place of Samuel H. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1906.

Frank R. Utter to be postmaster at Friendship, in the county of Allegany and State of New York, in place of Frank R. Utter. Incumbent's commission expires February 26, 1907.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Mack Brantley to be postmaster at Spring Hope, in the county of Nash and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

Charles T. Hickey to be postmaster at Spruce Pine, in the county of Mitchell and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

## OHIO.

James A. Downs to be postmaster at Scio, in the county of Harrison and State of Ohio, in place of William H. H. Masters. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1907.

## OREGON.

W. T. Bell to be postmaster at Enterprise, in the county of Wallowa and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

William A. Boyd to be postmaster at Sandy Lake, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William A. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expires February 26, 1907.

W. D. McGinniss to be postmaster at Emlenton, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Merrick Davidson. Incumbent's commission expires February 26, 1907.

## TEXAS.

Leander A. Canada to be postmaster at Morgan, in the county of Bosque and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

May Harrison to be postmaster at Rising Star, in the county of Eastland and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

Theodore Miller to be postmaster at Rusk, in the county of Cherokee and State of Texas, in place of Theodore Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1907.

## VIRGINIA.

John B. Grayson to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia, in place of John M. Campbell, resigned.

James H. Sumpter to be postmaster at Floyd, in the county of Floyd and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28, 1907.*

## COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Richard A. Ballinger, of Seattle, Wash., to be Commissioner of the General Land Office.

## APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

William C. Besselièvre, jr., of Massachusetts, to be constructor in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

## REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

David J. Girard, of Eureka, Cal., to be register of the land office at Eureka, Cal.

Samuel A. Abbey, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo., to take effect March 3, 1907.

Lee Fairbanks, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Del Norte, Colo., to take effect March 3, 1907.

Addison T. Smith, of Boise, Idaho, to be register of the land office at Boise, Idaho.

## RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Edward S. Wiggins, of Oklahoma, to be receiver of public moneys at Woodward, Okla.

Alfred C. Steinman, of Ellensburg, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at North Yakima, Wash.

## POSTMASTERS.

## CALIFORNIA.

John W. Short to be postmaster at Fresno, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

## COLORADO.

George S. Mott to be postmaster at Telluride, in the county of San Miguel and State of Colorado.

George W. Shuler to be postmaster at Holyoke, in the county of Phillips and State of Colorado.

## IDAHO.

Orville J. Butler to be postmaster at Harrison, in the county of Kootenai and State of Idaho.

William D. Hardwick to be postmaster at Nezperce, in the county of Nez Perce and State of Idaho.

Millie R. Longfellow to be postmaster at Mountain Home, in the county of Elmore and State of Idaho.

Olof Olson to be postmaster at Troy, in the county of Latah and State of Idaho.

## ILLINOIS.

Adolph Fehrman to be postmaster at Pekin, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois.

Theodore A. Fritchey to be postmaster at Olney, in the county of Richland and State of Illinois.

William A. Hardy to be postmaster at Springvalley, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

William C. Heining to be postmaster at Red Bud, in the county of Randolph and State of Illinois.

Andrew J. Pickrell to be postmaster at Anna, in the county of Union and State of Illinois.

George C. Roberts to be postmaster at Greenview, in the county of Menard and State of Illinois.

Charles Scofield to be postmaster at Marengo, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois.

Allen T. Spivey to be postmaster at Shawneetown, in the county of Gallatin and State of Illinois.

Edwin L. Welton to be postmaster at Centralia, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois.

## INDIAN TERRITORY.

W. S. Browning to be postmaster at Weleetka, in district 13, Indian Territory.

## MAINE.

Seth T. Snipe to be postmaster at Bath, in the State of Maine.

## MARYLAND.

Sewell M. Moore to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Dorchester and State of Maryland.

## MISSOURI.

John L. Schmitz to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Livingston and State of Missouri.

## NEW JERSEY.

Thomas E. Hunt to be postmaster at Penn Grove, in the county of Salem and State of New Jersey.

Adam Kandle to be postmaster at Elmer, in the county of Salem and State of New Jersey.

## NEW YORK.

Andrew D. Annable to be postmaster at Otego, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

Warren B. Ashmead to be postmaster at Jamaica, in the county of Queens and State of New York.

Hiram W. Vedder to be postmaster at Waterford, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York.

## OREGON.

George W. McQueen to be postmaster at Cottage Grove, in the county of Lane and State of Oregon.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. H. Lea to be postmaster at Carnegie, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel R. McMorran to be postmaster at Aspinwall, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Herman H. North to be postmaster at Bradford, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania.

## TEXAS.

Isham H. Nelson to be postmaster at Snyder, in the county of Scurry and State of Texas.

Laura M. Poe to be postmaster at Santa Anna, in the county of Coleman and State of Texas.

Jacob J. Utts to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Van Zandt and State of Texas.

Wilber H. Webber to be postmaster at Lampasas, in the county of Lampasas and State of Texas.

David M. Wilson to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Wise and State of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 28, 1907.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

## EXPLANATION.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain a statement I made on the day of the last session of the House. On page 1784 of the RECORD of January 26, during the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill, after the paragraph in relation to breeding animals was stricken out on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] offered an amendment restoring that part of the paragraph relating to the appropriation to aid the State experimental station in carrying on this work, but leaving the amount to be appropriated at \$50,000, as originally carried in the bill. To that I offered an amendment reducing the amount carried in the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado from \$50,000 to \$25,000. In explanation of my amendment I made the statement "and I am informed that it was understood among the members of the committee that if the proviso went out the amount should be reduced to \$25,000, which is the current appropriation." The basis for that statement was remarks that were made here about me on the floor at that time concerning the matter; but I have since been informed by the chairman of the committee having in charge the agricultural appropriation bill that there was no agreement; there was no understanding whatever relative to the amount that was to be carried by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] in the event that the proviso went out, as stated by me, and that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] in offering the amendment as he did did not do so in violation of any agreement or any understanding whatever. I wish to exonerate him entirely from the implication in my remarks. The statement I made was incorrect and not justified by the fact. I make this statement in justice to the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the RECORD to be corrected?

Mr. TAWNEY. I just want to make that statement in explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota for his very kind action in making the correction, and also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] for his statement to the same effect.

## POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution:

The Clerk read as follows (H. J. Res. 230):

Resolved, That the Joint Commission of Congress appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, approved June 26, 1906, shall not be deemed to be discharged by the presentation to the Senate or the House of Representatives of its said report, but is hereby continued in existence with all the powers created by said act until the termination of the present session of Congress for the purpose of completing the preparation, printing, and publication of the record of the hearings held by said Commission, and for the preparation, printing, and publication of an index and digest of the same. And the unexpended balance of the appropriation for said Commission in said act shall be available for the expenses of the said Commission. And that payments that have been made or are hereafter to be made on account of the expenses of the said Commission, upon vouchers approved by the chairman thereof, shall be deemed held and taken and

are hereby declared to be conclusive upon all Departments and officers of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield to me? Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think this resolution ought to pass the House. That Commission has not finished its work, not because of any fault of its own, but because they have not had time. It appears to me to be a matter of very great importance in the economical administration of the Department; and I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

## REPORT OF POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana presented the report of the Postal Commission authorized by Congress to make inquiry regarding second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

- S. 5380. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6044. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4629. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6634. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7021. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. McJunkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5171. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie H. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2748. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7078. An act granting a pension to Daniel Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7218. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2954. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7491. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna V. Blaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5970. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7492. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Clow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3563. An act granting an increase of pension to Orin D. Sisco—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7452. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6956. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Ford, alias Jacob Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6711. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey B. F. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6713. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7683. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wakefield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5400. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7509. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4958. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Duffield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5782. An act granting an increase of pension to Octave L. F. E. Fariola—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4396. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 3434. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Canfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7379. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7025. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. West—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 7672. An act granting an increase of pension to Elvina Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5261. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.